UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Radio Service

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

YOUR FARM REPORTER AT WASHINGTON. Thursday, January 1, 1931.

Federal Farm Board Interview No. 67: The New Year of Cooperation.

ANNOUNCEMENT: Your farm reporter at Washington starts the New Year right today. He is going to tell us of his interview with one of the officials of the cooperative marketing division of the Federal Farm Board ---- Well, Mr. Reporter? ----

****

Where do we stand on cooperation today?

As you know, this part year has been a big year for farmers' associations in a good many lines. There have been locals, and regionals, and nationals formed.

Things have happened so fast and furious at times, that they were hard to keep up with.

That's the reason I asked Dr. Hutzel Metzger, assistant chief of the cooperative marketing division, of the Federal Farm Board, to give us the broad picture of what has happened; to sort of check up with us on this big cooperative movement.

He tells me we now have over 12,000 associations reporting to the Board. That's a lot of associations. But this is a big farming country. What do those figures mean? And how many members did those associations have? And how much business did they do?---That's the question. We've had co-ops long before today. How do the business, and membership, and number of associations today compare with a few years back?

Well, of course, that varies with the kind of farm stuff you're talking about. We have associations for marketing such things as forage crops, poultry, and wool, and nuts whereas fifteen years ago, we never had any co-ops in those lines at all. On the other hand, some of the older types of associations, such as livestock co-ops, have also shown a remarkable increase in numbers in the last five years.

As for the business, our farmers' selling and buying associations do in a year's time, Dr. Metzger tells me that is running well over two billion ----yes, I said two billion five hundred million dollars worth of business a year. That represents business being done by and for more than three million members. And when you check off those members who belong to more than one association; that represents the business being done by two million farmers.

Of course, talking about billions of dollars and millions of farmers, don't mean much to most of us. We know that's a lot of farmers, and more money than any of us have got. Those big figures sound impressive; and they do represent substantial growth. We can well feel proud of what has been done so far. But we have all passed the Little Jack Horner stage.

At this time of the year, we like to look facts in the face and see just where we stand, and what's ahead of us.

Dr. Metzger says that the billions of business now done by farmers cooperatively, represents just about a fifth of the total business done by farmers. Those two million farmers represent just about one-third of the farmers of this country. For every man in a co-op, there are still two on the outside.

That makes it look like we have a long row to hoe yet. And so we have. But I would do an injustice to Dr. Metzger and what he told me, if I left you with just that picture. It is worth noting that he said that nearly every grower in these United States has a co-op handy through which he could market his stuff. It is also worth noting that this past year, nearly three-fourths of the associations, which have about two-thirds of the co-op members in the country, and do almost two-thirds of the business, are in our big farming region made up of eleven North Central States.

It must be confessed, though, that most of those associations are either just local associations or co-ops which operate in only a limited territory. Many of them, almost up to now, have been only handling the farmers' stuff in a limited way at some local point. In many cases, cooperative marketing has ended at the local point. It has stopped far short of the market.

And that brings us to what, as Dr. Metzger sees it, makes this New Year as especially important. It is not the number of members or the number of associations or the amount of business that is as impressive as the widest and apparent soundness of the program for closer cooperation all the way from the farm to the market.

As you know, we now have national sales agencies to handle several of our chief crops. There is the Farmers National Grain Corporation in which farmers' wheat and other grain organizations are working together.

There is the National Wool Marketing Corporation, and The American Cotton Cooperative Association, and the National Bean Marketing Association, and the National Livestock Marketing Association, and the National Pecan Marketing Association, and the National Beet Growers Association.

Nor are those seven all, in addition to those national associations, we now have regional cooperatives handling cheese, and butter, and turkeys, and eggs and poultry, and citrus fruits, and walnuts, and potatoes, and other kinds of farm stuff.

During this year on which we have just started, there will undoubtedly be other local associations formed. Locals over considerable region and in lines not yet so closely organized will probably be welded into regionals. Some regionals may be even formed into other nationals. But Dr. Metzger refused to speculate as to just what commodities would be next to come into a more complete form of cooperation by cooperatives.

However, it is not the nation-wide completeness of some of these new organizations which seems to please Dr. Metzger most. He thinks that one of the most significant phases of our new cooperative movement is the more business-like way co-ops are now managed. For twenty-five years, various farmers associations have been training managers and members. Some of those old associations had rocky going, and some actually went on the rocks. Out of their experience, the bad ones as well as the good ones, has come a wealth of knowledge of how a co-op should and should not be run.

Instead of independent co-ops scattered here, there, and everywhere, each competing with the other, the farmers in a number of lines now present a united front. We go into this New Year with a remarkable framework set up on which to build through this year and into the years to come.

As Dr. Metzger points out, the Federal Farm Board and other organizations have joined forces on a forward-looking program of education in practical cooperation. Future farmers will this year be trained in principles of cooperation and informed as to market supply and demand. The men who enter co-ops in the years to come will be better prepared to meet the high duties and responsibilities which rest on each individual co-op member.

****

ANNOUNCEMENT: Your farm reporter at Washington has just reported to you a New Year message of cooperation from Dr. Hutzel Metgzer, assistant chief of the cooperative marketing division of the Federal Farm Board. Station _____begins its New Year with this continued cooperation with the Federal Farm Board and the United States Department of Agriculture.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Radio Service
OFFICE OF INFORMATION

YOUR FARM REPORTER AT WASHINGTON Friday, January 2, 1931.

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

Speaking Time: 10 Minutes.

Dairy Interview No. 69: ENVIRONMENT VS. HEREDITY---DAIRY TYPE VS.BEEF TYPE

ANNOUNCEMENT: Here is Your Farm Reporter at Washington, again, presented by Station_____through the cooperation of the United States Department of Agriculture. He brings us today some interesting answers to interesting questions, on the dairy cow and dairy-farming. All right, Mr. Reporter, let's hear them....

****

Which plays a bigger part in the life and achievements of the dairy cow----heredity, or environment?

I think you'll agree it's a good question. And here's another one:

What are the differences, in type, between a dairy cow and a beef cow?

Well, these are two questions that I took the opportunity to bring up in my wanderings around the Bureau of Dairy Industry the last week. What I have to tell you today is how Uncle Sam's dairy specialists answered them.

And here's how---

Taking them in order, which DOES play a bigger part, environment, or heredity?

Well, Mr. M. H. Fohrman, of the Bureau of Dairy Industry, has been studying this particular question very thoroughly. I'll try to explain what he told me as best I can.

In the first place, we all know, of course, that environment does affect heritage very materially. That is, suppose you have a cow capable of producing 600 pounds of butterfat a year. Environment---in the form

of not enough feeding, or exposure to bad weather or what not---might step in and reduce this possible 600-pound production to 300 pounds, or 200. The cow might never come near the limit of which she is capable. For that matter, records of Dairy Herd-Improvement Associations show many cases of this kind---where potential high-producers are actually low-producers because of environment.

But let's take it the other way. Environment can hold back a cow with inherited high-producing ability; but can it cause a cow to produce ABOVE her INHERITED ability? No, it cannot. A 100-pound cow, no matter what she is fed or how she is cared for---and that's that.

Several years ago the Department of Agriculture began a study of the official records of three dairy breeds.

After making due allowance for the influence of age, they found that there was still quite a difference between the second record that the cow actually made, and the record that her FIRST record showed that she could have made in her second year. If age had been the only influence, and with the age allowance figured in, there would have been no difference. As it was, the average difference was 40 per cent.

Well, what caused this difference? The only answer is environment. And so, Mr. Fohrman estimates, on the basis of the thousands of records studied, that heredity is responsible for approximately 60 per cent of present-day production and environment 40 per cent.

That is, environment INTERFERED with heredity to the extent of 40 per cent.

Now, you might ask, just what does all this mean, anyway, from a practical standpoint. Well, as I get it from Mr. Fohrman, there are at least two points that are well to remember.

First, give the cow a chance. The only way to tell just how good a cow she really is, is to make her environment as perfect as possible.

Second, it is easy to spot the low-producer, in the proper environment. Remember that she can not exceed her inherited ability. And so if she is fed and housed and cared for properly, and fails to respond, she brands herself as an incurable low-producer.

But the first thing, of course, is to give her a fair chance.

And now about that other question: What are the real differences, in type, between a dairy cow and a beef cow?

Well, it seems that the differences are surprisingly few.

If you attended the National Dairy Show Exposition at St. Louis in 1929, you'll remember the Department of Agriculture exhibit. Two skeletons were placed side by side, one of a dairy cow and the other of a beef cow. They were arranged so that the heads were not seen from the entrance side, and so everyone had a chance to decide which was which. Hundreds of people, most of them dairymen, guessed---and not a few of them guessed wrong.

The exhibit was intended to show that there is actually very little difference between the skeletal structure of the dairy cow and that of the beef cow---and it showed it to everybody's satisfaction.

According to Mr. W. W. Swett, Bureau of Dairy Industry specialist, the difference in outward appearance is due not to skeletal structure--- but to extreme fleshing on the one hand, and to udder development and absence of fleshing on the other.

The main difference between the beef and dairy cow, aside from outward appearance, is of course in the udder. Carefully-taken cross-section pictures show that the dairy cow's udder is composed almost entirely of tissue which secretes milk. On the other hand, the beef cow's udder contains only a very small amount of this tissue.

"The results of these investigations surprised everybody a little bit," Mr. Swett admits. "We have been thinking of dairy type and beef type as being pretty definite and distinct. We've considered them as being almost entirely different types of machines. We looked at outward appearance and assumed that inward structure was equally as different.

"But we found that we had been exaggerating a little bit."

Breeding and selection, by which we have developed distinctive dairy and beef types, have not altered the skeletal structure to any extent.

****

ANNOUNCEMENT: You have been listening to Your Farm Reporter at Washington, bringing you his Friday report on questions of interest to dairy farmers. Your Reporter will be back on the air from Station_____ at this same time next Monday.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Radio Service
OFFICE OF INFORMATION

n3yo

YOUR FARM REPORTER AT WASHINGTON. Monday, January 5, 1931.

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

Speaking Time: 10 minutes. All Regions.

GROWING PORK THE CONSUMER WANTS

OPENING ANNOUNCEMENT: This is Monday, the day that Station _____ broadcasts the regular livestock FARM REPORTER PROGRAM. The Reporter's subject for this talk is GROWING PORK THE CONSUMER WANTS. All right, Mr. Reporter, tell us what kind of pork the consumer wants.

All right, folks, All you hog raisers gather in around the loud speaker so we can talk about the kind of hogs that boost your bank account, pay off mortgages, and make the best pork chops.

Times are always and eternally changing. I used to enter the Washington street cars at the back end and pay a conductor. On my way to the agricultural grounds this morning for my regular livestock interview I missed the first car trying to get on the back end and barely got aboard the next car by climbing on the front end and paying the motorman who is also the conductor. One-man street cars are getting to be the fad in many cities, and other changes of equal importance are taking place every day. What is new and modern today may be discarded for something better tomorrow, and that's why we are always changing from old to new, obsolete to modern, and taking up new fads, new fancies, and new models.

The question is often raised, "Are these changes for the best?", and thats the first question I asked Mr. E.Z. Russell in charge of swine investigations for the United States Bureau of Animal Industry in my interview with him this morning on GROWING PORK THE CONSUMER WANTS.

Swinging around in his chair in his little two-by-four office in one of the old, temporary war buildings, Mr. Russell met me with this question--- "How long has it been since you saw a 500-pound market hog?"

Naturally, I had to admit that a hog of that size hadn't crossed in front of my eyes for several years. Reading my mind as fast, or faster, than it was working, the old Nebraska hog farmer said,

"Why, don't you see those big hogs any more? They used to be common when you and I were boys, but they are few and far between at the present time, and there's a good reason for it."

"That's just what I want you to tell ME," I countered.

"All right," said Mr. Russell. "When I was a boy back on a Nebraska hog farm and you were a boy down on a Tennessee farm we used to boast about how big we could make a hog grow, didn't we?"

"That's right," I answered.

"You bet it is," he replied, "But that day is gone, and at the present time we are marketing the bulk of our hogs around the 200-pound mark and delivering them to the trade at an earlier age than we formerly did.

"We are doing that," continued Mr. Russell "because the consumer is getting away from that large lard-type hog."

"What do you mean?" I questioned.

"Just this," he replied, "As a general rule a hog that weighs, say, 500 pounds contains a lot of fat which, when cooked, turns to lard or grease. We used to use that grease for cooking back in the olden days, but we don't use nearly so much of it now. We now use more compounds for cooking, and we find that pork with not quite so much fat in it is what meets our demands.

"Now, since we don't especially care for this large lard-type hog any more, we have changed our size of hogs and now market them around the 200-pound mark instead of the big 500 pounders we used to brag about. Naturally, we've made that change because the pork consumer wants and likes the smaller hog and because the butcher or packer can get more desirable cuts from the medium-sized hog."

Reaching in his desk Mr. Russell pulled out two colored pictures showing two different hams. One ham came from a 200-pound hog and had very little fat on it. The other ham was from a 400-pound hog and contained a large amount of pure fat.

"Now," he said, "the butcher who buys this big hog will have to trim off and dispose of that fat or lard the best way he can. Naturally, lard is cheaper than ham, therefore the butcher will have to sacrifice much of the fat in the form of trimmings before he can market the ham.

"In the case of the medium-weight hog the ham is not covered with so much fat and consequently the butcher gets more profitable cuts from this type of hog. That's why the butchers and packers prefer the medium-weight hogs, and as I have told you before, the consumer prefers the medium-weight hog because it produces the cuts in popular demand without so much fat."

Mr. Russell told me that what he said about fat hams from big hogs also applied to shoulders, loins, bacon strips, and even spareribs. In other words, a big, fat hog produces a lot of fat which must be made into lard. We used to eat that fat to a very great extent, but like the street cars we have changed our fashions and now we want choice cuts from medium instead of heavy-weight hogs. That's what the consumer wants at the present time and that's what the packer wants because he wants to please the consumer trade-----and that's the whole thing in a nut shell---we are producing medium-weight hogs today because the consumer wants them.

The choicest cut of a hog is the loin, the next best cut is perhaps the bacon strips, and then the hams, shoulders, and finally the lard.

Mr. Russell told me about judging and placing 40 club pigs at one of the big fairs last fall. He placed the fattest pig last because it was simply too fat for the most economical cuts.

Of course, I was interested in what Mr. Russell was telling me about cuts, fat, lard, and so forth, but I wanted him to wind up the story by telling me how to produce these medium-weight hogs to the best advantage. And without my asking, he did it.

"Now Mr. Reporter," he said, "we have been growing hogs at the Government field stations for a number of years and here's what we have found out even though it may not sound true it's a fact. We have the records to back up the statements."

"For four years we have been running one particular test at one of our mid-west field stations. This test is to find out, among other things, whether it's more profitable to market hogs at 6 months of age, weighing around 200 pounds apiece, or to hold and market them at 9 months of age when they weigh around 300 pounds apiece.

"For this test we have two sets of pigs. One bunch of, say, 50 pigs are farrowed and pushed right along until they are marketed at around 6 months of age and when they weigh approximately 200 pounds apiece. These pigs have access to a self-feeder containing corn and tankage and are provided with a mineral and pasture when it's available.

"The other pigs are farrowed at the same time, well cared for but fed a limited ration instead of a "pushing" ration. They are generally marketed at around 9 months of age and usually weigh pretty close to 300 pounds apiece when marketed.

"Now, here's the interesting part of this experiment," said Mr. Russell. "For four years straight the medium-weight hogs pushed from the time they were farrowed until they were sold at 6 months of age--- brought on an average of $3 a hundred pounds more than the pigs produced on limited rations, and sold at 9 months of age. The young pigs weighed about 200 pounds apiece at the time of marketing and the 9-months-old pigs weighed around 300 pounds apiece.

"Let me say before I close the interview," said Mr. Russell, "that if we grow the kind of pork the consumer wants, likes best, and is willing to pay most for, we'll produce the medium-weight hogs weighing around 200 pounds at market age.

"Now, in order to grow this hog in the most profitable manner, I believe it ought to be pushed from the time it is farrowed until the day it is weighed on the scales at the market. If your listeners want more information along this line ask them to write for Farmers' Bulletin No.1437-F SWINE PRODUCTION and Farmers' Bulletin No. 1504-F SELF-FEEDING VERSUS HAND FEEDING OF SOWS AND LITTERS."

CLOSING ANNOUNCEMENT: Ladies and gentlemen, you have been listening to one of the regular Farm Reporter programs broadcast from Station____ in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture. Write this station if you want copies of Farmers' Bulletin No. 1437-F SWINE PRODUCTION, and Farmers' Bulletin No. 1504-F SELF-FEEDING VERSUS HAND FEEDING OF SOWS AND LITTERS.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Radio Service
OFFICE OF INFORMATION

3 40

YOUR FARM REPORTER AT WASHINGTON — Tuesday, January 6, 1931

Crops and Soils Interview No. 1: — When Will The Depression End?

ANNOUNCEMENT: Your farm reporter at Washington asks the specialists of the United States Department of Agriculture questions which you suggest to him. Today, he brings us an answer on one of the chief questions in many mens' minds, as we head into this New Year ------ Well, Mr. Reporter?

*****

Here's the question.

We are all interested in getting some idea of when the demand for farm products is going to pick up.

"When will the depression end?"

As Patrick Henry would say; I know of no way of judging the future, but by the past.

That's about what Mr. L. H. Bean says. Only he says it in figures. Mr. Bean is an economist of the United States Department of Agriculture. He has compared this present "Slough of Despond" with some of the other depressions we've been bogged in in recent years; and he has come to some pretty definite conclusions, as to just when we are likely to reach rising ground. ---------

No. I'm not going to give you all the involved figures he uses. Neither am I going to tease you along by first showing you how he arrives at his conclusions.

Of course, he admits that this depression may be "something else yet again." But he finds that so far this decline has followed much the same sort of course as did the Big Slump of 1920 and 21. If it keeps on as it has been going, Mr. Bean declares that we may expect a slow recovery.

Before the end of this year, or the first part of next, he estimates, business activity will be about back to normal.

If that happens, as he suggests, it will mean better markets for practically all farm products. Such improved markets, he says, would be reflected in rising prices ---- granting, of course, that production stays the same.

"Back to normal" by the end of this year or the first of next! That's what Mr. Bean figures. "It's a Long, long trail, a-winding," but

Mr. Bean seems to have worked this thing out carefully.

In considering this bog of depression, he points out, that the question of demand for farm products is not so simple as some folks seem to think.

It seems to be that for our own convenience we just class everything raised on the farm as "farm products". Then we get to talking about "farm products" as if they were one thing, instead of a lot of different things. In a lot of cases, the demand for one kind of farm stuff is considerably different from the demand for some other farm product.

In the case of cotton, for instance, the demand on the part of manufacturers and middlemen who use this farm product as raw material, is the demand that counts. Food stuffs raised on the farm, are influenced more directly by the buying power of consumers, of course. In the case of wheat, however, we have to consider the international demand and financial conditions.

Mr. Bean showed me how he has charted the ups and downs of those different demands for farm stuff, and how the ups and downs of business generally, taken by and large, has gone along pretty much the same up and down hill course. Since the War, he points out, we've had four periods of business prosperity, in 1920, 1923, 1926 and 1929. Following those fat years on the heights, we've descended into the valleys. In 1920 and 21, you recall, we had quite a slump. That depression, lasted 18 months. The ones in 1923-24 and 1926-27 didn't go so deep or last so long. We just ran along in those depressions for 14 to 15 months.

The 1930 gully is already wider and deeper than the big depression of 1920-21. We've already been in it for more than 18 months now, according to Mr. Bean's charts. Those charts are just historical pictures of conditions. From them you can see just how farm prices and business conditions have had similar ups and downs since the War.

You all know how it works. As Mr. Bean interprets it, in the case of food stuffs, wholesale dealers pay farmers more or less for their stuff in the wholesale markets depending on the state of business, or on what they are able to sell the stuff for in the retail markets.

When building slows up or factories slow down, payrolls are smaller, and consumers have less to buy with. The demand falls off. Almost every time the city worker pulls his belt in a notch, it seems that the man on the farm feels the pinch.

And, Mr. Bean reminds me, this depression we are passing through is practically world wide. So our farm prices here in the United States are affected not only by reduced demand here at home, but also by a falling off in foreign demand. That less demand abroad has been brought about by increased unemployment in England, and Germany, and other European countries, Also by the world-wide drop in prices for stuff from which much of the world's population gets its income; such as for wheat in Argentina and Canada, wool in Australia, and cotton in Egypt and India.

Mr. Bean, however, had taken all these different things into con-

sideration. He has tried to weigh and balance them all so as to find whether we're headed further into the hole and well on toward rising ground.

When you think of recent declines in stocks and bonds, and reports of country bank failures, and the drop in buying power of farmers due to the drought, and the falling off in foreign demand and the increased foreign competition in industrial and agricultural products, the situation would seem to suggest things getting no better fast.

On the other hand, plans for expansion in construction work by city, state, and federal governments suggest improvement in conditions. So do the low interest rates. Mr. Bean says low interest rates favor some advance in building activity. Low cotton prices favor a recovery of the textile industry. The big cut in automobile manufacture and the reduction of dealers stocks favor some recovery in the automobile business. And improvement in those lines would also be reflected in the iron and steel business.

It all seems to simmer down to a question of whether these conditions making for improvement will outweigh the conditions working against improvement.

To decide which weighs the most, Mr. Bean has gone back to his history of the other depressions. Weighing and balancing the many complex factors on the scales of past experience, he says we may look for a slow recovery. And this good year of 1931 will see us well on toward normal business. That he says would tend to improve markets for practically all agricultural products. They all went down in the depression of 1929-30. They will all come up again in 1931-32, Mr. Bean adds, if farm production stays the same.

***

ANNOUNCEMENT: Your farm reporter at Washington has just told you when the depression will end, according to estimates of Mr. L. H. Bean of the United States Department of Agriculture. This good news comes to you through the cooperation of Station_____ with the Department. Keep a sharp lookout for the outlook report.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Radio Service

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

YOUR FARM REPORTER AT WASHINGTON. Wednesday, January 7, 1931.

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

Speaking Time: 10 Minutes.

WHAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS DOING FOR THE POULTRY INDUSTRY.

Opening Announcement: Ladies and gentlemen, Station_____ takes pleasure in presenting YOUR WASHINGTON FARM REPORTER. His subject for this occasion is WHAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS DOING FOR THE POULTRY INDUSTRY. All right, Mr. Reporter.

---oOo---

What's the United States Government doing for the poultry raisers in this country? That's the question I asked Dr. Morley A. Jull the other day. Dr. Jull, as many of you know, is in charge of the poultry office of the United States Department of Agriculture and is one of the best poultry authorities in this or any other country.

"Well," said Dr. Jull, as he began to pull papers from his desk, "our Government is doing a lot for the poultry raisers. For example, poultry extension work is now being carried on in every single one of the 48 States in the Union and the territory of Hawaii."

Does the Government foster this poultry extension work? I asked.

"It certainly does," was his candid reply. "For instance, in 1929 there were 76 extension poultry specialists who spent their full time working to improve poultry conditions throughout the country and to make the industry more profitable to the thousands of men and women engaged in producing, growing and caring for the millions of chickens scattered from the board walks of Atlantic City, New Jersey, to the orange groves of southern California, and from Michigan Boulevard in Chicago to Canal Street in New Orleans."

"Dr. Jull," I interrupted. "If 76 poultry extension people spend their whole time working to improve poultry conditions and poultry itself, they evidently do a lot of work. Tell me about some of the special ways they help poultry raisers."

"With pleasure," he replied. "To begin with the 1928 reports of nearly 4,000 county extension workers showed that nearly eight per cent of their entire time was spent on poultry. These reports further show that nearly a half million poultry raisers adopted better poultry methods as a result of this extension work."

Catching Dr. Jull's keen eye for just a second I said, "What you are telling me sounds like a mighty good, constructive piece of work."

"You bet it is," was his quick response. "Why," he said, "the 1928 reports from nearly 2,000 county extension workers showed that poultry raisers had been influenced to feed better rations on more than 90,000 farms. In the junior work there were more than 4,000 poultry clubs organized in which approximately 100,000 boys and girls were enrolled."

Now folks, you all know that it's one thing to start a project and another thing to finish it up and receive the reward, and I thought I'd throw cold water on Dr. Jull's enthusiasm when I asked, "How many of these club members finished their poultry projects?"

"More than 60,000," he replied. "That's nearly two thirds of all of those who enrolled. These boys and girls not only finished the prescribed course but they actually and successfully raised more than a million birds."

Pointing to a picture of a culling demonstration on the wall of his office Dr. Jull said, "That one thing alone has been worth millions to the poultry raisers of the country. It has taught them to get rid of the unprofitable hens and this in turn allows more feed for those that produce the eggs.

"In addition to culling demonstrations extension workers have helped farmers get purebred cockerels and females which have boosted egg production in their flocks. The average egg production per hen in many of these flocks say 10 years ago was something like 120 eggs a hen. Today that average has climbed until it's around 150 eggs per hen. Quite a bit of this improvement can undoubtedly be traced to the wide interest in the selection of better hens and better cockerels.

"Uncle Sam's poultry extension workers have done another good piece of work in boosting modern methods of controlling insect pests, and parasites."

"Give me an example," I broke in.

"Gladly," replied Dr. Jull. Looking me straight in the eye he said, "Did you ever hear of any army general destroying his enemy's food supplies, and so starving him into surrender?"

"Yes," I said, "it seems to me that I recall reading about something of that kind at a place they call Yorktown."

"You're a good historian," he laughed and you got my point. In the destruction of some of the worst poultry parasites we have to contend with we have found that the easiest way to make these trouble makers surrender is to destroy the host that harbors them at some stage of their life. For instance, we have found that grasshoppers, ground beetles, and even snails are among the recently discovered intermediate hosts of certain poultry parasites. Of course, as soon as these things are proved here at the Government poultry farm and at our various experiment stations, the extension people carry them to the farms of the poultry raisers throughout the country, and in that way the good work of the Federal Government goes on and on."

In addition to helping poultry raisers control parasites and insects, Uncle Sam has done his bit in reducing avian or fowl tuberculosis in the poultry flocks of the country. That disease is found in the flocks of the Corn Belt, on the Pacific Coast, in the East, and is slowly spreading to other sections of the country. Poultry raisers everywhere should acquaint themselves with the disease and its control and be prepared to first, prevent its gaining entrance to the flock and second, know how to eradicate the disease in case it gets a foothold.

Every now and then a fraudulent drug preparation for poultry diseases for which there is no known drug treatment, appears on the market. Uncle Sam is constantly on the lookout for such things, and does his best to stop them before they reach the poultryman.

Grading eggs, grading poultry, and the marketing of poultry, eggs, turkeys, ducks, and geese are some more of the poultry projects carried on by the Federal Government for the benefit of the producer back on the farm.

Now folks, I have mentioned these things not to advertise our Government. It doesn't need advertising. It's able to stand alone. I've mentioned a few of the ways in which your Government and mine helps poultry raisers in order to drive home the fact that it's an easy matter to get accurate, reliable poultry information from the hundreds, yes even thousands, of county extension workers now employed throughout the country. The poultry information they possess comes from their State college of agriculture and from the United States Department of Agriculture, and is therefore, the latest, the most modern and the most practical information available at the present time. Use this information, and use these extension people in producing, growing, and managing better and more profitable birds during the year of 1931.

I've told you only a few of the many things Dr. Jull talked to me about, but I'm already approaching a red traffic light so I must apply the brakes. In closing let me remind you that Uncle Sam has many free publications of special value to poultry raisers.

CLOSING ANNOUNCEMENT: You have been listening to one of the regular Farm Reporter programs broadcast from Station_____ in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture. If you want specific poultry information get in touch with your county agent, your State college of agriculture or write to the United States Department of Agriculture in Washington, D. C.

--oOo--

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Radio Service
OFFICE OF INFORMATION

YOUR FARM REPORTER AT WASHINGTON. Thursday, January 8, 1931.

Federal Farm Board Interview No. 68: Regional Dairy Associations.

ANNOUNCEMENT: Each Thursday your farm reporter at Washington reports to us the results of an interview with some specialist of the Federal Farm Board. Today his report has to do with milk associations-----but let's hear from your Farm Reporter himself ---- All right, Mr. Reporter? -----

****

These are the days of big things, important things, in the marketing of farm stuff.

As our great cooperative movement swings into its stride, we begin to appreciate some of the changes which are taking place, in many lines of farming.

The tendency seems to be for local associations to get together. The old motto of "in Union There is Strength" seems to have been adopted by co-ops. We often think of fluid milk co-ops, organized to supply nearby cities, as being peculiarly local. But from what Mr. T. G. Stitts says, in telling me about some of the pertinent problems now prominent in the milk business, the fluid milk associations are getting closer together, and tending to take in more and more territory. In other words, the forward-looking locals are going together to form regional fluid-milk associations.

Mr. Stitts is with the cooperative marketing division of the Federal Farm Board. As the Farm Board is encouraging more complete cooperation by farmers, Mr. Stitts is in close touch with the latest developments.

He says that in spite of what the drought did to us, there is a big increase in the supply of fluid milk in all the important cities. And on top of our having more milk than usual, there has been some falling off in the use of milk. As you may know, that has made the supply problems of our fluid milk marketing associations extremely acute; to put it mildly, and in dignified language.

Consumption of fluid milk has apparently fallen off more in the strictly industrial cities like Detroit, Mr. Stitts tells me, than it has in cities like Baltimore and Washington where the pinch of unemployment has been less keenly felt.

Anyway, the producers' cooperative associations have made a very careful study of the whole situation. And although they were formed primarily to represent the milk producers, they appreciate that the consumers must be given special consideration. Things being as they are, the farmers associations have been willing to make the price of milk in the eastern cities lower as long as the cut in prices was passed on in the retail price, so the consumers could get the benefit of it.

However, Mr. Stitts estimates that the price of milk is now pretty well adjusted to conditions. It is worth noting, he points out, that the adjustments in prices have been most orderly where the producers have been best organized.

If milk prices are forced down too low, he says, his experience is, that production is often decreased, sometimes to the point of causing a shortage and boosting prices unduly later on.

And that's not the only way consumers may lose by extra low prices on milk. In fact, Mr. Stitts seems to think that it is a downright misfortune to milk consumers, for milk to get too cheap.

He points out that cheap milk, is more likely to be <u>cheap</u> milk. When the price of milk is low it is harder to get high quality production.

There is no question about it, he figures. It costs more to produce high quality milk with a low bacteria count. And because it costs more, producers must be paid more to produce it. He declares that the attention they have given to quality is one of the outstanding contributions of the dairy cooperative associations in the past ten years.

However, there is this one thing to be said in favor of the present situation. The over-supply in some markets and the drop in consumption, are making dairy farmers who have not been in co-ops do some tall thinking. The acute situation has stimulated some careful study and thought which may work together to the strengthening of the position of the co-ops. As Mr. Stitts says, it also seems to be an opportunity for demonstrating the effectiveness of the several different methods now being used for controlling surplus milk in those markets.

Of course, the situation is worse in some markets than in others. In fact, in a few of the markets there has been no need for changes in prices, due to the fact that those markets do not have too much milk.

At the present time, in the New England States, Mr. Stitts tells me, an effort is being made to coordinate the activities of all the cooperative organizations. That's so the producers may be able to make a united stand. Under the plan under consideration, all the producers will be represented by a single agency.

Right now there are a number of co-ops on the New England markets. Each has its own selling plan. However, it is one of the hopeful signs along the milky way, that real progress is being made toward the formation of a regional organization, which will bring into one unit a large number of the cooperative associations now operating in New England.

Mr. Stitts figures that the proposed new association will have up to three-fourths of all the fluid milk from about 30,000 farms in the metropolitan Boston area. If this plan goes through in the New England States, a single organization will represent the cooperative creameries of Vermont and other New England States.

According to the plan, the New England milk producers associations will sell through a single agency and the same one-price policy will prevail throughout the organization. This plan has the support of the big dealers in the market.

But this New England regional is not the only prospect for closer cooperation among milk associations. The sales organization for Baltimore and Washington co-ops were recently united, and are now working together. And Mr. Stitts understands that two other associations in the same region have made application to affiliate with those which have already joined hands.

This tendency of milk associations to expand and take in more and more territory, Mr. Stitts declares, is one of the significant trends in marketing of fluid milk at the present time. He says it is undoubtedly a sound policy for cooperatives. It has been brought about because the dealers are expanding their activities, but the chief reason is the need of having a market plan which not only applies to the principal market but is coordinated with the selling of milk in nearby cities. The New England Milk Producers Association which supplies the city of Boston also serves some 22 other cities in New England, and the same tendency is seen around Chicago. Co-ops in Philadelphia, New York and a number of other markets are also serving a number of cities where conditions closely relate these minor markets with the main market.

****

ANNOUNCEMENT: Your farm reporter at Washington has just outlined for you some of the pertinent problems of the fluid milk business as discussed by Mr. T. G. Stitts, of the cooperative marketing division of the Federal Farm Board. This Station _____ cooperates with the Federal Farm Board and the United States Department of Agriculture in presenting this feature.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Radio Service
OFFICE OF INFORMATION

YOUR FARM REPORTER AT WASHINGTON

Friday, January 9, 1931

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

Speaking Time: 10 minutes.

Dairy Interview No. 70: CASEIN---CINDERELLA OF THE DAIRY INDUSTRY

ANNOUNCEMENT: Your Farm Reporter at Washington, here at this time with his weekly report for dairy farmers, gives us a look today at what is perhaps the most spectacular off-shoot of the dairy industry. He is going to talk about casein---and so, about the things for which casein is used. Station_____ presents Your Farm Reporter through the cooperation of the United States Department of Agriculture. Here we go. ...

- - -

Somehow, the casein industry has been regarded as a sort of stepchild of the dairy industry.

It is a Cinderella which has not yet found its slipper.

In many respects it IS the most spectacular branch of the dairy business. Possibly, also, we have more frequent contact with casein in our everyday lives than we do with any other product of the dairy cow.

And yet, the fact remains that very few people know much about it.

When casein is mentioned what do you think of?

Well, whatever you dairymen think of, there are a lot of folks who may think of billard balls and fountain pens.

Or they may say, "Oh sure, that's the stuff they make buttons out of."

Hardly any of us give a thought to the dairy cow when we thumb

through a magazine. And certainly we don't usually connect the peaceful, contented cow with the airplane whizzing along overhead.

Yet, the fact is, three-fourths of all the casein manufactured goes into the making of glazed or coated paper. If your magazine or book is printed on coated paper---and most magazines are--- you can be sure that the dairy cow deserves some of the credit.

Furthermore, the second most important use of casein is in the manufacture of waterproof glues---which are used among other things in making airplanes.

Uncle Sam alone bought 13 million pounds of casein for this purpose during the World War.

Casein has many other uses---most of them because of its waterproofing and adhesive or sticking, qualities.

It is a base for waterproof and cold-proof paints; it is often a filler for linoleum, and, for instance, window shades; it is sometimes used in making leather. Ammunition manufacturers use casein in waterproofing shot-gun shells. Small quantities of edible casein go into the making of powdered medicines.

At the present time, chemists are experimenting with casein as a filler for rayon and other cloths---the idea being to give the cloth more body.

These are not all of the roles played by casein, by any means; but they are the main ones enumerated by Mr. C. S. Trimble, a manufacturing specialist of the Bureau of Dairy Industry, of the United States Department of Agriculture, when I talked with him the other day.

Well, all these facts are very interesting; BUT, I asked Mr. Trimble, what do they mean in a practical way, to the dairy farmer?

Well, there are already many uses for casein---some of which are just being developed. And new uses are being discovered. With a little more attention, perhaps this step-child of the dairy industry may become one of the most important members of the family!

The point is that greater demand for casein means greater outlets for milk. And of course anything that is going to stimulate consumption of any dairy product is bound to be all to the good for the dairy industry as a whole.

As a matter of fact, if the United States produced all the casein it used, the casein industry could not be called a step-child of the dairy industry.

Compare casein with dry skim milk, for instance.

If we had produced all the casein used in this country since 1921, we would have used nearly 75 per cent more skim-milk for casein than was used to make dry-skim milk; in figures, something like 7 billion pounds as compared with 4 billion pounds.

But there's the catch---we didn't make all casein we used. In fact, except for three years---1919, 1924, and 1929---we have annually imported more casein---think of it---than we have produced ourselves.

If you want to study the possibilities of the casein industry in the United States, I guess this is about as good a place as any to start.

So far as the American dairy farmer is concerned, it makes little difference how many new uses are found for casein, as long as the casein comes from some other country.

But it would, undoubtedly, make quite a difference, if you yourself, speaking collectively, furnished the milk from which all this casein is made.

Now, according to Mr. Trimble, the pass-word here is the same old word so vital to all other branches of the dairy industry. Three guesses--- and the first one is right; The word is QUALITY.

"Quality production," Mr. Trimble declared," is just as important in making casein as it is in making butter or cheese, or any other dairy product. It is especially important with casein, because of the competition from other countries."

Well, let's go back for a moment and see what casein is and how it is made.

First of all, casein makes up about 3 per cent of milk. Cheese can not be made without casein. Speaking broadly, casein is the curd you see in sour milk.

There are several methods of removing casein from milk; but all follow the same general principle. First, the milk is curdled, either by natural souring, or by adding some acid such as hydro-chloric or sulphuric acid. Then this curd is heated and firmed up, so that the whey can be drained off, and sugar, ash, and other materials washed out.

The milk has to be skimmilk, incidentally, because fat makes for poor quality.

Now, the Bureau of Dairy Industry has been, and still is experimenting with various methods, with an eye to improving quality.

The fact is, that we can make just as good casein(if not better) here in the United States as we can buy from other countries. And we ARE making such casein.

The trouble seems to be that we are not making enough of the high-quality kind---that is, some of our American-made casein is very good and some of it is not.

On the other hand, the quality of casein which most other countries send us is uniform in grade. They get this uniformity by blending the production of many plants.

A large amount of the imported casein, or about 85 per cent of it, comes from the Argentine. France sends us the next largest amount of our imports. Under Argentina's blending system her casein is very uniform in quality, and many large American users have come to rely on it and buy it because it is uniform.

So this is the problem that American casein producers have to meet, according to Mr. Trimble. Obviously, the only way to meet it is to make our own product so high in quality and so uniform in grade that it will successfully compete with the imported product.

As this is done, we may expect the market for the American dairy cow's milk will be expanded by just that much.

- - - - -

ANNOUNCEMENT: Ladies and Gentlemen, you have been listening to Your Farm Reporter at Washington, who has just brought you a report on Casein and its Uses. Your Reporter will be back again Monday at this same hour, with a report of special interest to livestock men.

- - -

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Radio Service
OFFICE OF INFORMATION

YOUR FARM REPORTER AT WASHINGTON Monday, January 12, 1931

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

Speaking Time: 10 Minutes. All Regions

RAT CONTROL ON THE AVERAGE FARM

OPENING ANNOUNCEMENT: Ladies and gentlemen, this is Monday, January 12, the day when we hear from our Washington Farm Reporter on some agricultural subject especially applicable to livestock producers but generally of interest to everybody. That's the case today. The Reporter is going to talk about RATS. That's such an important topic that I'm going to put the Reporter on the air right now.

--ooOoo--

Hello folks! I want to talk to you for a little while today about an interesting bit of scientific information I gathered from Mr. James Silver, who is a supervisor of rodent control of the United States Bureau of Biological Survey.

It happened this way. The other morning as I was making my usual rounds down in one of the old temporary war buildings over near the Smithsonian Institution and Lindbergh's historic airplane, I chanced to see a beautiful plant growing profusely in the office of James Silver.

Now I have known Mr. Silver for a number of years and I know that his job is to try to keep the rats off of the farms in this country, so I was curious to know what he was doing growing plants in the middle of the winter, and was even bold enough to ask why.

Well, that question started the ball rolling, and now if you'll listen, I'll talk and we'll wind up with a lot of information about the rat that gave the hairs of his tail for banjo strings long, long ago.

The plant that I saw growing in Mr. Silver's office was a red squill, and he said he was growing it to satisfy curiosity hunters like myself, who are always asking questions about rat poisons and other things.

Red squill, he said, is the name of a perennial flowering bulb that grows profusely in the Mediterranean country, particularly in Sardinia, southern Italy, and Libya.

This bulb, though smooth, looks quite a bit like the ordinary pineapple with a short green top, which is so familiar on many fruit stands at this season of the year. There's a white squill bulb too, and perhaps other varieties, but at this particular time we are interested only in the red squill bulb, because it's the Pied Piper of Hamelin when it comes to destroying rats.

Red squill bulbs grow in the winter. During the hot summer months, however they die down and rest, and then the powder made from them is very poisonous to rats, because the poison in the bulbs seems to be unusually concentrated at this season. It is at this time that the bulbs are dug and shipped to the United States and I suppose to other countries as well.

On arrival here, the bulbs are dried and then ground into powder, and when this powder is eaten by old man long-tail rat------well, he's just telephoning the undertaker-----that's all.

Well folks, I can tell you that Mr. Silver certainly surprised me when he said, "Red squill powder is the most effective and most practical rat poison known at the present time. It kills rats, but is practically harmless to chickens, cats, dogs, pigs, and other domestic livestock."

I couldn't afford to let a statement like that get by unchallenged, so I asked why red squill didn't bother other animals, but killed rats.

"That's simple, " he answered. "If other animals eat red squill it acts as an emetic and they can't keep it down. But rats are not built that way,-----and if they eat it-----they can't get rid of it, and it's just too bad."

How about the taste of this red squill powder? I asked.

"That's a good question," he replied. Reaching up to a shelf above his desk he pulled down a tin can of red squill powder and opened it for me to inhale and inspect. I did both, but I didn't taste it-----for I didn't feel like experimenting that far.

Putting a small pinch of the powder on the back of my hand Mr. Silver gave it a gentle rub, I thought to spread it out so I could see it------but instantly there was a prickly burning similiar to the burn from a nettle. ------Folks,-----I thought sure I was poisoned, but Mr. Silver motioned me to a chair and then said,

"Red squill contains calcium-oxalate crystals, which, on coming in contact with the skin, cause a sensation similar to that of a nettle sting. Ordinary animals taste the powder on various baits-----receive this sting--don't like it----and leave the red squill alone. But rats----these pests must not be ordinary, for they don't seem to mind the sting at all, but go right on eating the bait and thereby make their last will and testament. That's one of the big reasons red squill is such a good rat poison. Ordinary farm animals, as a general rule, leave it alone and are safe---while rats eat it up and are lost."

Turning in his chair to a point where he could look a mounted rat squarely in the face, Mr. Silver said, "Do you know how much it costs to keep up that slick-tailed thief?"

Now I used to kill rats on rainy days when I was a boy and I know a little something about rats myself, but I never kept books on them, so I listened carefully to what Mr. Silver said.

"We made a survey not long ago," he said, "in the form of a questionnaire in one of the leading agricultural States to try to find out how much corn rats destroy after it has been harvested and put in the corn cribs. That report showed that they destroy more than 5 per cent of the corn that is actually placed in the crib every year. Over a 10-year average that loss amounted to more than $70,000,000 a year. Think of it. "70,000,000 dollars worth of corn used in this country for fattening rats every year. And that's not all. Rats eat young corn when it's sprouting in the spring, they climb up the stalks, eat roasting ears in the summer, they eat corn when it's shocked, corn in the crib, corn at the mill, meal after it has been ground, meal at home in the pantry, bread after it has been cooked, and I suppose there may even be stories of where rats have taken bread out of the mouths of orphans, but I don't know about those."

Mr. Silver says that rats are among the most prolific of all animals. Under favorable conditions one pair will have at least 6 litters a year, and there are from 8 to 10 rats in each litter. There are probably less rats to-day than 10 years ago. That's because of modern methods in building construction, better sanitation, and a growing knowledge of how to control rats.

If there are plenty of rats about your farm----there's likely a good reason. Can you figure out that reason?

Mr. Silver says that if you take away rat feed, destroy breeding places, and make the whole layout unfavorable to rats, you'll be well on the road to rat control. If your neighbors will do the same thing, your community will not be troubled very much with rats.

Rats like to harbor around stable feed troughs, under stable floors, especially floors just a few inches above the ground or those almost on the ground, and in double walls of buildings. Do you have any such places around your farm? If you do, naturally you are not going to tear them down as a result of this radio talk, but that's a good point to remember in remodeling old buildings or in constructing new ones.

The best way to control rats is to make your property an undesirable place for them to breed, eat, and quarter in. That's hard to do on some farms on account of the layout and construction of buildings. In that case, the next best thing to do is to kill off the rats, and the best way to kill them off is to poison them, and the best poison is RED SQUILL. Red squill powder for poisoning rats was worked out in the United States Department of Agriculture by scientists not more than 5 or 6 years ago, and it is now used more than any other rat poison on the market. If you need to poison rats----try red squill.

My limited time will not permit me to go into details of just how to bait and poison rats, but Mr. Silver gave me a copy of Farmers' Bulletin No. 1533-F called RAT CONTROL that goes into this matter step by step and in a very thorough and practical manner. This bulletin contains 22 illustrated pages of usable information on the control of rats whether you live on Main street in your home town, or whether you run a farm in Florida, Tennessee,

Michigan, California or New Hampshire. The information is there, and a postal card will bring it to your mail box. If you don't already have a copy of this bulletin, let me urge you to get one and help get rid of the 100,000,000 rats eating up $200,000,000 worth of food and feed in this country of ours from one year's end to the next. Thank you and good bye.

--ooOoo--

CLOSING ANNOUNCEMENT: You have been listening to Your Washington Farm Reporter in one of the regular Farm Reporter programs broadcast from Station _____in cooperation with the Federal Department of Agriculture. If you want a copy of Farmers' Bulletin No.1533-F called RAT CONTROL, and telling about red squill, write to this station, or if you prefer, to the United States Department of Agriculture, in Washington, D. C.

--ooOoo--

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Radio Service
OFFICE OF INFORMATION

.34o

YOUR FARM REPORTER AT WASHINGTON RELEASE Tuesday, January 13, 1931

Crops and Soils Interview No. 2: Stop Pouring the Farm Down the Gully.

Announcement: Your Farm Reporter at Washington brings us word each week on important farm problems. He has a report on one for us today. Specialists of the United States Department of Agriculture tell him this question of gullies and soil washing is a National menace. In all parts of this country, farms are being robbed of their fertility ---- But your reporter will tell you about that --- well, Mr. Reporter? -------

---

I am reporting to you today from Dr. A. G. McCall, chief of the soil investigations of the United States Department of Agriculture.

Dr. McCall says one of his earliest recollections, as a boy on a farm, was in hauling rotten fodder and brush to put in the gullies. Everybody had 'em. And everybody had the idea that there was not much you could do about 'em. Just dump in the fodder, and hope that the first big rain didn't wash it all out.

Maybe gullies weren't so bad where you were brought up. Some soils do gully worse than others. Some soils have more natural resistance to washing and gullying. And other soils gully less than others, because of the management, Dr. McCall says.

That is, some land is not cut up by gullies for the simple reason that it is kept covered the year round, or the farmer leaves strips of grass or cover-crops of some kind to prevent the movement of water down the slope.

In Missouri and other parts of the Mid-West, farmers have developed a very clever device for checking gullies. They take an old empty fertilizer sack and fill it full of sod, and then stake it down in the gully. Then the grass grows out through the open meshes of the fertilizer bag.

Dr. McCall says he guesses fertilizer bags are better than any other kind, because there is usually a little fertilizer sticking in the meshes to give the grass the pep to start up.

Other places, farmers stake down brush --------

"But why bring that up?" you say. "We were building brush dams and filling in gullies, maybe before Dr. McCall was. Why all the fuss about soil washing these days?"

Dr. McCall explains that. As long as we had plenty of land, and a farmer could just abandon a field and clear woodland, he wasn't very much concerned about land washing. Nowdays, competition is keen. Good land is necessary to meet that competition. A farmer just can't afford to put high-priced labor on poor, gullied land.

Labor used to be about the cheapest thing a farmer had. A few acres more or less didn't make much difference. Now, with keen competition for world markets, it is up to the farmer to reduce his production costs. And Dr. McCall insists that one of the easiest ways to do that, is to eliminate the lands of low-producing capacity and confine ourselves to better land.

And if that better land is in cultivation we must take measures to preserve the surface soil. Of course, you don't get much gullying on any but the more or less rolling land. However, all the rich top soil that washes off land doesn't go down the gullies. Often there is a more or less uniform washing of the entire surface.

That sheet erosion doesn't attract the attention a gully does. Dr. McCall declares it is just as effective in reducing the productive capacity of the soil as is gullying. It is even more dangerous. You can hardly overlook a gully. You may even fall in it. In fact, farm houses and barns have been known to fall in gullies in some sections of the country. Sheet erosion, however, is a sneak-thief. The top soil filled with rich plant food may be slowly planed off a gentle slope and the damage be hardly noticed until too late.

In many sections of the Middle West, Dr. McCall says, it was hard for years to get farmers to admit that erosion is causing heavy losses. Now they know it. They can read it from the thinner stands and shorter corn near the top of the slope than at the base. They can read it in the less-responsive sub-soil in which they now have to plant.

And sad to say, the loss is permanent. Land may lose in one generation, what it will take five centruies to build back. That is not mere guesswork either. The Missouri Experiment Station, has for ten years kept tab on the rate at which soil is removed by washing. The show-me experts set concrete tanks at the edge of slope, so arranged that they could actually catch and measure the soil washed off each year from a moderate slope. Some of the land was cropped with corn, some was covered with grass, and some left bare in order to compare what happens under different management of the land.

That was a moderate slope, but erosion may occur anywhere water can run down hill. That means on practically any farm land; although, of course, the washing is apt to be more serious on steep slopes.

Dr. McCall says that when the slope is not too great, terracing will help check the soil from washing away. On steeper slopes, cover crops are necessary, to prevent the loss of the top-soil. It is well worth while to stop those gullies and that sneaky sheet wash. It is estimated that every year the farmers of this country lose about $200,000,000 worth of plant food in soil washed from their fields.

This soil washing, in one form or another is so serious a national problem, that our government has established experiment stations in the more seriously eroded regions. The Bureau of Chemistry and Soils, and the Bureau of Public Roads, and the U. S. Forest Service are cooperating in studying soil washing and means of preventing it in different soils and different regions.

Those Experiment Stations are good-sized farms, cropped as practical farming land. When land is overgrazed, soil washing begins to get in its damaging work, and as our National Forests contain vast ranges for livestock, the Forest Service experts are interested from that standpoint. Then, too, when land is so badly washed as to become unfit for forage crops, reforestation is the only remedy; so the foresters also handle that phase of the study. The Bureau of Public Roads supplies the engineers to work out the best ways of building terraces and soil saving dams for stoppage of large gullies in the various types of soil. The Bureau of Chemistry and Soils is concerned more directly with the measurement of the soil losses under different conditions.

We now have seven of these soil-wash experiment farms. One at Statesville, North Carolina, a second at Tyler, Texas, on soil typical of the sandy clay lands of Northeast Texas, Louisiana, and Arkansas. A Third on the black, waxy lands of Temple, Texas. A fourth at Guthrie, Oklahoma. A fifth at Bethany, Missouri, a sixth at Hays, Kansas, and a seventh at Pullman, Washington. They are all seeking better ways of saving soil.

In the meanwhile, however, Dr. McCall says the States are becoming aroused to the necessity of doing something. County Agents in some counties are holding terracing schools to show farmers how to stake out and throw up soil saving terraces. Several million acres of farm lands have been terraced in the last four years. It's a fight to preserve land values. Already enough is known of the general principles of preventing fertility losses, for farmers to do much to help themselves. As Dr. McCall says; "Stop, look, and fill those gullies."

ANNOUNCEMENT: There is a publication on this subject of erosion. It is called "Soil Erosion; A National Menace." It can be had by writing to this Station or by writing direct to the United States Department of Agriculture, At Washington, D. C. Ask for Circular 33. Practical pointers on "Gullies and How to Control Them" can be had from Farmers' Bulletin 1234; while "Terracing Farm Lands" is described in Farmers' Bulletin 1386.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Radio Service
OFFICE OF INFORMATION

YOUR FARM REPORTER AT WASHINGTON

Wednesday, January 14,1931

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

Speaking Time: 10 Minutes.

Poultry Interview No. 71: THE CHANGING POULTRY POPULATION

ANNOUNCEMENT: Here is Your Farm Reporter at Washington, and to-day he brings us a preliminary report on the 1930 census of our poultry population. The figures are not complete, but they give some idea of what is happening within the poultry industry, and the extent to which the poultry population is changing and shifting. All right, Mr. Reporter....

******

It seems to be the general opinion that there's been quite an increase in poultry raising during the last 10 years.

Well, so far the census figures that have been compiled indicate that an increase occurred. But it is a sectional matter----and so the general country-wide increase may possibly not be so great as many have expected.

As a matter of fact, no reports have been issued yet for the Southwest, the Rocky Mountain States, or the Pacific Coast, and only scattering returns have come in from the Middle West. The only regions reported at all completely are New England and States along the Atlantic seaboard.

However, these early figures do show some interesting developments.

For instance, the indications are that the big gains have come in commercial poultry raising, rather than in the raising of poultry as a side issue on general farms.

In fact, decreases are reported from several general farming sections.

New England and the other Northeastern States, which are centers of big-scale poultry raising, report big gains.

The poultry population increased 5 per cent in Maine, 20 per cent in New Hampshire and Rhode Island, 35 per cent in Massachusetts, and 38 per cent in Connecticut. Vermont is the only member of the northeastern group in which the chicken population slumped, the number falling off 5 per cent.

Now, coming down the coast, we find Delaware with the largest gain yet, 40 per cent. Twenty counties in New Jersey report a gain of 62 per cent

But then, coming still further south into Maryland and Virginia, the increases slow up. There is practically no change in the figures for the 18 Maryland counties compiled up to date, and the seven Virginia counties are 14 per cent UNDER the 1920 figures.

In general, the number of chickens in the South, Southeastern States seems to have gone down. The one county in Georgia heard from shows a decrease of 17 per cent; 18 Tennessee counties, a decrease of 23 per cent; 11 Kentucky counties, a decrease of 17 per cent; and six counties in West Virginia, a decrease of 12 per cent.

In the few scattered reports that have come in from the Middle West the increases and decreases just about balance up.

Of course, one main reason for the big increases in the commercial-poultry-farming sections is the increase in size of flocks. Back in 1920 when the last census was taken, there were very few commercial farms with more than 5,000 hens. To-day, flocks of from 10,000 to 15,000 hens are not uncommon in the large-scale farming sections.

For that matter, with the development of skyscraper houses and modern equipment, it is not uncommon to find several thousand hens under a single roof.

In fact, I recently noticed a picture in a magazine, of a poultry hous which housed 50,000 laying hens and pullets.

When you get several farms like these in the same region, it doesn't take long for the total to count up.

Now, so far as I know, there are no figures available on the changes in the numbers of each breed. However, Mr. A. R. Lee, poultry husbandman for the Department of Agriculture, made a comment the other day that has some bearing on this point.

The big commercial farms, where the big gains in population occurred, keep White Leghorns as a general rule. However, Mr. Lee points out, there IS now a growing interest in the egg-producing possibilities of the heavier breeds------especially the Rhode Island Reds and the Barred Plymouth Rocks.

Just for example, take one of the recent, egg-laying contests conducted in New Jersey. The entries of White Leghorns exceeded the entries of all other breeds combined. But the contest was led by a pen of Rhode Island Reds; and of the 10 highest pens, four were either Rhode Island Reds or Barred Plymouth Rocks.

Now, speaking more particularly of the census, Mr. Lee was wondering just how many poultry raisers were able to report accurately how many chickens they had during the year, and how many eggs they were getting.

Well, from all reports, the number who were able to do this was rather limited.

And this led Mr. Lee to emphasize, again, the very real importance of keeping records----not for the sake of the census, of course, but from the standpoint of good business.

I guess the value of taking inventory and keeping records is so generally recognized that it hardly needs repeating. I know a lot of poultry raisers who do keep accurate records. On the other hand, I know a lot of them who can not even tell you how many eggs their hens are producing-----which is the simplest form of record there is.

In Mr. Lee's opinion, only a few simple records are necessary for the average farm flock. A record of egg production, by all means should be kept and then records of receipts and of expenses.

Big, commercial poultry raisers, of course, find it necessary to keep records of labor and records of hatching, and brooding.

At any rate, now is a good time to take that inventory and to start your records-----that is, if you haven't already started. And in this connection you will undoubtedly find some good suggestions in a bulletin called "Business Records for Poultry Keepers," which was published by the Department of Agriculture about a year ago. It is Farmers' Bulletin No. 1614-F.

You may also want, by the way, Farmers' Bulletin No. 1182, called "Farm Inventories."

If you do want copies of either or both publications, drop a line to Station_____, or direct to the U.S. Department of Agriculture in Washington, D.C. These bulletins will be sent free of charge, as long as the supply lasts.

****

ANNOUNCEMENT: Ladies and gentlemen, you have been listening to Your Farm Reporter at Washington, who has just brought you a report on preliminary figures from the 1930 poultry census. Let me repeat the titles and numbers of those two bulletins. "Business Records for Poultry Keepers," is Farmers' Bulletin No. 1614; and "Farm Inventories" is Farmers' Bulletin No. 1182. Address your requests either to Station_____ or to the United States Department of Agriculture in Washington, D.C.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE Radio Service OFFICE OF INFORMATION

3 4 70

YOUR FARM REPORTER AT WASHINGTON RELEASE Thursday, January 15, 1931.

Federal Farm Board Interview No. 3: Progress in Livestock Cooperation.

ANNOUNCEMENT: Each week your farm reporter at Washington reports to us some of the developments in cooperation as outlined to him by specialists of the Federal Farm Board. Today, he is going to tell us what has been done and what lies ahead in livestock marketing by co-ops ----- Well, Mr. Reporter -------

- - - -

Of course, you all know about the National Livestock Marketing Association.

It is the biggest livestock cooperative which has ever operated in this country. It is really a gigantic federation of eighteen big member agencies. Producers of cattle, and hogs, and sheep, and goats own and control those member organizations, so this nation-wide association truly belongs to livestock farmers and ranchmen.

Its incorporation last May and start up in business last July was a great event in the history of livestock marketing in this country. Although practically all the member organizations had years of successful business experience back of them, their banding together was a striking achievement.

Mr. C. G. Randell, of the cooperative Marketing division of the Federal Farm Board, tells me nearly all sections of the country are now blanketed with livestock organizations, owned and controlled by livestock producers, and working together through the National Livestock Marketing Association.

The only exceptions are the Pacific Northwest and certain Eastern States. In Washington, northern Oregon, and parts of Idaho, livestock producers have no local or terminal organizations, but even those producers have terminal co-ops available to them when they move their livestock east.

In the Eastern States, there is a section made up of Virginia,

West Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Tennessee, and North Carolina, where there is also a lack of marketing organizations. However, in Virginia and West Virginia local shipping associations have been established and are functioning efficiently.

A meeting was recently held by representatives of most of these States to decide on some marketing plan, with a view to setting up farmer owned agencies at terminal markets.

That meeting appointed a committee to study and work out a definite plan and report at a conference to be called later.

Outside these two territories, the rest of the United States is already blanketed by cooperative livestock organizations, Mr. Randell says.

"What can those organizations do?" I asked Mr. Randell. "We hear a lot about orderly marketing and the benefits of nation-wide commodity marketing organizations, but some folks are always skeptical."

"One thing," he said, "the National Livestock Marketing Association can improve our system of distribution.

For example, sometimes when pasture conditions are good in the Southwest, a lot of cattle are shipped from Texas to the Pacific Coast as grass-fat cattle, which ordinarily go to Corn Belt stackmen as feeder cattle. Well, a train load or two of cattle arriving unexpectedly on a market can often cause a big slump in prices. The point is that with this tie-up of organizations throughout the country, the cattle won't arrive "unexpectedly." Through the National's information system, co-op members on that sales market will know what is coming. Forewarned is forearmed. They can keep other cattle off the market that day, and so avoid glutting the market, and shoving down prices to unwarranted levels.

That's just one illustration. Through its Research Department the National can gather information on pasture conditions. Say you have a drought. Maybe it is just a local drought. But you may realize that if it keeps up much longer the cattle will be in too bad shape to move. Instead of rushing that stock to market maybe at a sacrifice, the producer can bill the livestock to the terminal and stop them off on the way at points where there is plenty of grass, where the National's information service shows that there is no drought.

Or maybe it is the more usual question of knowing the best market or the best time to ship to market. Favorable prices on one market may induce you to rush your cattle to that market, only to find when you get them there that the market is glutted, and prices are down again.

In other words, as Mr. Randell explains, the National, with member agencies in all sections of the country, can gather and distribute the information needed to prevent feast and famine markets which have

cost livestock farmers so much in the past.

Another advantage the National offers is better price information to the individual producers; distributed to them, of course, through the regional or local member association.

The aim of the Research department of the National, Mr. Randell says, will be to get out for its members the same class of material the trade association gives the corporations which are members of the trade association.

Too often, he declares, livestock growers feed livestock without looking ahead to see what the market will be. We produce livestock in a more or less hit or miss fashion. Of course, we get a lot of information from various agencies and institutions here, there, and everywhere. But up until we got this National Livestock Marketing Association, there was no one organization with information on all phases of marketing from all sections of the country, working for the individual co-op member, and able to get that information to him.

In the National in the last few months there has been set up the framework for more orderly production and marketing. The job this year as Mr. Randell outlines it, will be to put more meat on the bones. The National will assist member agencies to increase their volume of business.

Then, too, a number of livestock co-ops are not yet affiliated with the National organization. The way is open for those organizations to join the National at any time. In fact, some of those which were not in at the start, have made application to come in. Some others not affiliated with the National yet, have indicated they would like to become members of the new National Livestock Marketing Association. They see some of the advantages in this nation-wide hook-up of livestock cooperatives.

- - - - - -

ANNOUNCEMENT: Your farm reporter at Washington has just reported to you on cooperation among livestock farmers and ranchers. The Farm Board has just published a new bulletin on "Farmers Build Their Marketing Machinery," which gives the facts showing how the Agricultural Marketing Act helps in developing cooperative programs open to all growers. You can get a copy from the Director of Information, Federal Farm Board, at Washington, D. C. Ask for Federal Farm Board Bulletin No. 3.

- - - - - -

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Radio Service
OFFICE OF INFORMATION

9
n3yo

YOUR FARM REPORTER AT WASHINGTON Friday, January 16, 1931.

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

Speaking Time: 10 minutes.

Dairy Interview No. 71: MAKING MILK FROM THE SOIL

ANNOUNCEMENT: And now here is Your Farm Reporter at Washington, again, bringing you today his report for dairy farmers. He has been talking this week with Mr. J. B. Bain, of the Bureau of Dairy Industry of the U. S. Department of Agriculture; and now he's going to tell you something about "Making Milk from the Soil." .....making milk from the soil--- Well, Mr. Reporter it's a good trick if you can do it. Let's have it. ...

- - - - -

The object of keeping and milking cows is PROFIT. Unless there is a profit, there would seem to be little rhyme or reason to providing cows with food, shelter and attention.

True; very true, you might say; but what does this have to do with making milk from the soil?

Well, according to Mr. Bain, it has a lot to do with it.

"For example," he says; "the dairyman who buys much of his feed, either grain or roughage, has one chance of making a profit. His neighbor, on the other hand, who raises crops suitable for making milk, has TWO chances for profit. First, there is the profit in raising the crops; and second, the profit from feeding the crop to the cow.

"This man sells his crop to the cow at the market price, and obtains a profit as a crops farmer. Then he milks the cow and gets a second profit as a dairyman."

Well, when I was very much younger than I am now, I used to like to hang around the creamery in my home community. I remember that a very common question in those days was, "How many cows are you milking now?" I DON'T remember that there was very much interest in the QUANTITY of milk the cows produced.

Now, Mr. Bain says that later on--- especially when the 10 gallon can began to be popular---the old familiar question grew into two questions: Not only, "How many cows are you milking?, but also, "How many cans of milk are you shipping?"

Well, here it is now the year 1931---and the progressive 1931 idea goes still a step further. The question is, also, how many thousand pounds of milk are you getting per acre of land?---that is, land devoted to crops and pasture for the dairy herd.

As Mr. Bain puts it, "Getting the most profit from the dairy business now, is not only a matter of good milk-producing cows, but also of good milk-producing crops."

"You know, there is a vast difference in the ability of different crops to produce milk. Of course, the highest-producing cow in the country is helpless unless she gets foods which contain the ingredients for the manufacture of milk.

Among the best milk-making feeds, Mr. Bain mentioned particularly corn, alfalfa and the legumes---all legumes---and added that sweet clover is the most valuable milk-producing pasture crop.

He told me about the experiments of Professor Fraser of the University of Illinois, which show that producing milk from the soil is not only desirable, but practical. Professor Fraser believes that dairy farming is most profitable when it follows the same principle as grain-farming; that is, he would say "Produce milk from the land the same as you produce grain from the land."

To get actual proof of his belief he worked out a rotation of crops, and experimented for 6 years. Twenty acres of land was fenced off, and only crops or pasture grown from this 20 acres was used for feeding the 11 grade Holstein cows used in the test.

Now, bear in mind that the average yearly production of these individual cows ranged from 6,170 for the lowest to 8,965 pounds for the highest. In other words, there were no unusually high-producing cows, and on the other hand, no very low- producing cows.

Well, during the 6 years, these 11 cows, kept on 20 acres of land, produced, on the average, nearly 7500 pounds of milk and more than 260 pounds of butterfat, per cow per year. In round numbers, this figures out just slightly less than 4000 pounds of milk per ACRE, per year.

Professor Frazer reports that this is practically three times as much milk per acre as the average Illinois dairy farmer gets now.

Now, three main crops which Old Mother Nature has particularly endowed with the elements which make milk, are alfalfa, corn and sweet clover. Of course, this BIG THREE is subject to some modification, depending on where you live. Other legumes, such as lespedeza for instance, may be substituted, according to the section of the country.

At any rate, the Bureau of Dairy Industry believes that greater use of these home-grown milk-producing crops is one thing that will increase profits. And so they suggest taking this into serious consideration, when you plan crops for the coming year.

How many pounds of milk do you make per acre now? Are you making 4,000 pounds of milk per acre, from home-grown feeds alone? Well, these are good questions, and they ought to be interesting ones to figure out.

But in any case, here are some Department of Agriculture publications that you will probably want to have for your Farm Library, in this connection.

Here is a general bulletin on "Legume Hays for Milk Production," Farmers' Bulletin No. 1573.

And here are two on sweet clover. One is called "Sweet Clover" and is Leaflet No. 23-L. The other is "Sweet Clover on Corn Belt Farms," Farmers' Bulletin No. 1005.

If you are interested in lespedeza, write for Farmers' Bulletin No. 1143, called "Lespedeza as a Forage Crop."

There are, of course, a number of bulletins on alfalfa. Probably the two you'll be most interested in are "How to Grow Alfalfa," Farmers' Bulletin No 1283; and "Utilization of Alfalfa," Farmers' Bulletin No. 1229.

Let me remind you again, also, of that new bulletin on "Feeding Dairy Cows," Farmers' Bulletin No. 1626; and of the old familiar "Dairy Herd Improvement," Farmers' Bulletin No. 1532.

All of these publications, as you know, will be sent to you free of charge, as long as the supply lasts. Just drop a line either to Station_____ or to the U.S. Department of Agriculture in Washington, D. C.

- - - -

ANNOUNCEMENT: Ladies and gentlemen, you have been listening to a report on "Making Milk from the Soil," brought to you by Your Farm Reporter at Washington. Let me run over, again, that list of bulletins. All ready? "Legume Hays for Milk Production," Farmers' Bulletin No. 1573; "Sweet Clover," Leaflet No. 23-L; "Sweet Clover on Corn Belt Farms," Farmers' Bulletin No. 1005; "Lespedeza as a Forage Crop," Farmers' Bulletin No. 1143; "How to Grow Alfalfa," Farmers' Bulletin No. 1283; "Utilization of Alfalfa," Farmers' Bulletin No. 1229; "Feeding Dairy Cows," Farmers' Bulletin No. 1626; and "Dairy Herd Improvement," Farmers' Bulletin No. 1532. Address your requests either to Station___or direct to the U. S. Department of Agriculture in Washington, D. C.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Radio Service
OFFICE OF INFORMATION

YOUR FARM REPORTER AT WASHINGTON Monday, January 19, 1931.

(NOT FOR PUBLICATION)

SPEAKING TIME: 10 Minutes.

Livestock Interview: WHAT -- AND WHY -- IS THE R.O.P. TEST FOR SWINE?

ANNOUNCEMENT: And now, ladies and gentlemen, Station_____ again presents Your Farm Reporter at Washington. Monday is Your Reporter's day with livestockmen; and today he is going to tell you what he has learned about the record-of-performance test for hogs -- better known, perhaps, as the R.O.P. test. All right, Mr. Reporter: ----

--ooOoo--

I've been hearing so much about this R.O.P. test for hogs, that I went to see Mr. E. Z. Russell, and asked him to tell me what it was all about.

Mr. Russell, you know, is in charge of swine investigations for the United States Department of Agriculture.

Well, he took what may seem to be a rather roundabout way of getting at the subject. It was a good thing for me that he did and if you aren't already familiar with the R.O.P. plan, you may need a little background, just as I did.

Anyway, selection and breeding of hogs have been going on in the world for several hundred years, in the main, with one more or less definite purpose. That purpose, of course, is to produce hogs which make economical use of feed and which yield carcasses best fitted to the demands of consumers.

In the United States, we have been raising hogs, on a big scale, for just about 100 years. Now, there have been changes in type during this time. Mr. Russell remarks that most of these changes have undoubtedly come in responce to economic conditions -- that is, to pressure on the pocketbook. But, on the other hand, there have always been other important factors and some of these have really been of very little practical value.

Mr. Russell said, "It is just as true now as it was a century ago, that the only reason for raising hogs is to produce pork in the most efficient way.

"But, in looking back now, it is easy to see that many times during these last 100 years, we have been chasing rainbows, rather than strictly following the most economical methods."

Well, as I gather it, the R.O.P. tests were devised, in order to do away with this rainbow chasing.

What we want to find out, is just what are all the points that go to make up the best possible type of hog.

Speaking of our present-day types, Mr. Russell thinks it probable that hog growers are already somewhere near the point of greatest efficiency.

However, we don't know for sure because we haven't made up our minds -- or rather we haven't found out -- just what characteristics this best-possible hog should have. We can't say what necessary, or desirable, characteristics our modern types, lack.

First of all, of course, the grower wants a hog which will make weight at low cost. Brood sows must be prolific and good mothers, caring for their pigs carefully and nursing them well. The pigs must be hardy, with ability to resist parasites and disease; they must be good feeders; they must make rapid gains and mature at an early age. Above all, the fattened pig must yield a carcass which will meet the demands of the market.

Well, just how important is each of the many factors that go to make the ideal hog? It is very hard to say.

And if hog producers are not now on the right road to the most profitable type, Mr. Russell believes that the reason lies in the lack of an accurate standard. We have been selecting and breeding very largely according to appearance.

Within certain limits we know the kind of hog which can be produced at low cost and which satisfies market demands. But we do not know -- and in the past we have had no way to find out accurately -- whether the popular type is also the most efficient, most profitable type.

The purpose of the record-of-performance tests is to furnish an accurate way of finding out.

Well, why not? Dairy-cattle breeders, for example, have made wonderful progress in breeding for type and efficient production. The only thing needed to make possible the same success in hog raising is accurate standards. In fact, the country of Denmark has been following such standards for the last 18 years, with great success. The producers there based their plan of breeding on low-cost production and high carcass value; and as a result, they have greatly increased the profits from hog raising.

The Iowa Agricultural Experiment Station was the first to take up such work in this country. A couple of years ago the National Swine Growers Association appointed a committee and this committee has prepared a tentative plan under which several other State experiment stations are taking up the R.O.P. testing. Among them are Minnesota, Wisconsin, West Virginia, and Ohio.

"What the association hopes to do is this:" said Mr. Russell. "It figures that from the facts we get from these tests, we'll be able to set certain definite requirements for both the sire and dam of a litter, which will entitle them to be recorded in a register of merit. The register of merit, you see, will be established later on, we hope. As it is, the committee doesn't feel we have enough information yet, on which to establish the requirements.

"Now, here's how the R.O.P. or, record-of-performance, plan works under the present tentative outline. In the first place, only purebred, registered stock is admitted at present.

Well, we'll suppose that you have a litter of purebred pigs which you'd like to have tested. In order to be entered, a gilt must wean at least seven pigs at 56 days of age or an old sow must wean 8 pigs.

Then, you select 2 gilts and 2 barrows from this litter. Ship them to your State experiment station, and they pay you the market price for that day, for the four pigs.

The pigs are, first of all, immunized against hog cholera -- that is if they haven't been already.

On their 72nd day, the pigs are put on test with corn and a protein supplement fed in a self-feeder. They are slaughtered when they reach the weight of 225 pounds -- that is two of them -- one gilt and one barrow -- are slaughtered. Then dressing yields are determined and certain measurements are made on the carcass.

As the shipper of one of these litters you will be furnished with a certificate showing the cost of production in pounds of feed, the average daily gain, dressing yields, and so forth.

Also, if you so desire, you may buy back the remaining gilt in the litter at the market price.

Now, I may add that if you have a litter you'd like to have tested you should write to your State experiment station and ask if it is doing this work. And if you want more information, write either to your State college, to the United States Department of Agriculture, or to Radio Station _____.

--ooOoo--

CLOSING ANNOUNCEMENT: Ladies and gentlemen, you have been listening to Your Farm Reporter at Washington. He has just reported his interview with Mr. E. Z. Russell, of the United States Department of Agriculture, on "The record-of-performance Test for Swine." If you'd like to get more information on this subject, write to Station_____, or direct to the U. S. Department of Agriculture in Washington, D. C.

###

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Radio Service

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

34

YOUR FARM REPORTER AT WASHINGTON

Tuesday, January 20, 1931.

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

SPEAKING TIME: 10 Minutes.

Crops and Soils Interview No. 3: USING WASTE LAND.

ANNOUNCEMENT: Your farm reporter at Washington reports to us today, on what we can do with some of the land which doesn't pay in crops -- as most of us think of crops. He has been to the experts of the United States Department of Agriculture, and now comes back with a message on a very vital subject. Well, Mr. Reporter? ---

--ooOoo--

Someone has suggested, that some lands now being farmed at a loss, had much better be growing timber.

Well, I asked Mr. W. N. Sparhawk about that. Mr. Sparhawk is a forest economist in the United States Forest Service.

From what he tells me there is more to this question than just letting a few acres grow up in trees. It is a big public question, as well as something for the individual farmer to think over. It is important in connection with this "agricultural depression;" as they call this "hole" we are now in.

Mr. Sparhawk tells me that large areas have gone out of farming in the last ten years, especially in the older sections. The Northeast, the Lake States, and most of the Southern States have had big decreases. Furthermore, it doesn't look as if there was going to be much increase in farming country anyways near soon.

Now what are we going to do with that land which has been thrown out of a job. A lot of it is just being abandoned. That's not so much true of farming lands, as cut-over lands. Mr. Sparhawk figures that twenty million acres of land is now tax delinquent in the three Lake States alone.

One proposal has been to find some one to put that land back into forest growth. In those sections where there are big areas of cut-over or abandoned land, Mr. Sparhawk suggests that it would be a slow and painful job getting private timber land owners to do that.

Another way, which has been proposed, is to have the public buy the land, either the State or the Federal government. That plan might sound good to some farmers who want to sell woodlands scattered here and there. But Mr. Sparhawk thinks it would hardly be practical for the government to buy small scattered holdings. They would cost too much to administer. If such a plan were adopted, he holds it would be necessary to get large tracts; instead of shot-gunning around for a lot of individual units.

And he suggests that probably the best way to handle big consolidated tracts for timber growing would be by the zoning system. That is, these large timber land tracts would be used strictly for timber-growing. Instead of the few people in scattered settlements through the timberland trying the almost impossible job of supporting good roads and modern schools; the people and schools and other facilities would be concentrated in another zone, where there would be enough people to support community projects.

Of course, that's just a suggested solution where there are large sections of land best fit for timber growing. The Forest Service, without any large program as yet for helping out this waste farm land problem, is even now getting some of the cut-over land for timber growing under forest management. In the White and Green Mountains of New England, in Pennsylvania, in the Southern Appalachians, in the Lake States and in the South, certain areas have been blocked out and land is being purchased to be handled both for protection of watersheds and as a demonstration of what can be done in growing timber.

Some of the States, Mr. Sparhawk tells me, are also going into more or less large-scale conversion of waste lands into forests.

In Michigan, tax-delinquent lands revert to the State, and the State has planted large areas. In Wisconsin, such lands revert to the County, and county forests are being established under State management. New York has a program of buying abandoned land to be used for growing timber, and also helps individual counties to establish county forests. Massachusetts has a sizable program of town forests and State purchase. A good many other States are buying small areas. Indiana acquires several thousand acres a year for combination game, recreation, and forest preserves. Pennsylvania has bought more than one and a quarter million acres of cut-over land.

But let's get back to the farm. Mr. Sparhawk says that through the Extension Service, farmers are being gradually converted to better uses of farm woodland. A good deal of planting is being done by farmers. The Clark-McNary Act authorized the distribution of planting stock to farmers and $400,000 is spent annually for that purpose by the States and Federal Government. If you want planting stock, your State Forestry Department or your Extension Forester will put you in touch with the right place to get it. Over 25,000,000 trees were distributed last year in all the States. That is, just to farmers. However, Mr. Sparhawk says, we have about 130,000,000 acres in woodlands on farms.

As he sees it, most of that should not only be kept in woods, but be kept in producing condition. Most of it, sad to say, is not being managed for timber growing. All through the Central States are woodlands where there is little young stuff coming on. And, if the average farmer wants a little cord-wood, as likely as not, he goes out and cuts the nicest, straightest tree of the best species, and leaves the less valuable stock to seed the ground with the poorer species. There is little growing of trees as a crop.

Mr. Sparhawk admits, however, that one of our big problems in handling farm woodlands is marketing the timber. As a rule, the farmer has little to market at any one time. And he frequently gets gyped on what he does market. Some means of more intelligent marketing by a number of farmers cooperatively must be worked out.

In spite of the fact that farmers are weak on the marketing of their wood, Mr. Sparhawk claims that a good many farmers have found their woodlands life-savers. They have been able to turn woodlands into cash when other sources of income have failed.

A good many do their own logging, and make wages for themselves and teams in hauling the stuff they sell into the mills. During the recent drought, the only income some farmers had, they got from their woods.

The two things you hear most about in connection with woods are fire and taxes. But in the farm woods, Mr. Sparhawk says, fire is not the factor it is in the big forest. Most farm woods are cut up into small parts. The owner is around practically all the time. Fire has little chance to start, without being detected promptly, and put out -- except in the South where the practice of burning to help grazing has become a very costly custom.

As for that other certainty, taxes; taxes may be high, but they are usually lower than if the land was cleared. In fact, Mr. Sparhawk declares that the farm woods don't increase taxes much. The farm taxes in most cases would be about the same if the woodland was just cut off the assessment.

The difference is that with woodland, you have cord wood, and posts, and timber to supply some cash income and help pay its own way. If you are going to keep that land as part of your farm, it ought to be raising something. Better grow timber crops than let the land lie idle.

Mr. Sparhawk suggests that if you are considering growing timber crops, it would be a good idea to get hold of your State forester or Extension forester and find out what trees to plant and where to plant them, and where to get planting stock. Or if you already have a farm woods, find out when to cut and what to cut and where to sell your products to the best advantage.

ANNOUNCEMENT: Your farm reporter at Washington has just given you a few of the high points from his talk with Mr. W. N. Sparhawk, forest economist, of the United States Forest Service, on the subject of uses for waste farm lands. This report is made to you by Station_____ in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Radio Service
OFFICE OF INFORMATION

3Yo

YOUR FARM REPORTER AT WASHINGTON Wednesday, January 21, 1931

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

SPEAKING TIME: 10 Minutes

EGGS FROM TIN HENS

ANNOUNCEMENT: In the development of our big food manufacturing industries, we have learned to can everything from cake to meat. Among the newer names to be put on the long list of canned products we find eggs. Your Farm Reporter at Washington is going to tell you something about the frozen and dried egg industry in his regular talk over Station _____. This program is presented through the cooperation of the U. S. Department of Agriculture. Mr. Reporter ---

--000--

Jokes about the tin cow are out of date. Condensed and evaporated milk have become staple products.

We have accepted, too, the idea of eggs from tin hens. At least, the 45 million dollars worth of frozen and dried eggs that the United States used in 1929 would make you think so.

Canned milk is a familiar sight in many American kitchens. But as for canned eggs, they come into the home in the form of candy, cakes, pies, bread, salad dressing. That's one reason why we don't know the tin hen as well as we do the tin cow.

Mr. Roy C. Potts, in charge of the poultry products division of the U. S. Department of Agriculture, has been telling me something about these relatively new preserved-egg products. Many of our important food industries have been using them more and more in recent years. They are more economical, more convenient, and in some cases more suitable than shell eggs.

The United States uses much less dried eggs than frozen eggs, Mr. Potts says. We have a few food industries in which dried eggs are required. But for the most part, frozen eggs can be substituted for the dried, depending on the market prices of each. The drying of eggs is still pretty much of a Chinese industry. But as for frozen eggs, this country has been producing a large part of what she uses, particularly in the last year.

It's the bakers who use the largest amount of frozen eggs. For example, they use frozen yolks and frozen mixed eggs for such products as pound cakes, sponge cakes, and layer cakes. The frozen whites are used in making angel food cake, icing, filling, and various confections. Some persons say that cake-making is rapidly going the way that bread-making went---from the home to the bakery. If that is the case, within the next few years the market for frozen eggs may be increased three-fold.

Out changing appetites account for still another market for frozen eggs. Today we eat a great deal of fresh fruits and vegetables. And along with this we use salad dressings to make the dishes attractive and tasty. A great many eggs, particularly frozen ones, are used in the manufacture of one of these dressings---mayonnaise. The frozen eggs make a better product than shell eggs, the specialists say.

In the confectionery industry you find a large demand for frozen whites. They are used in such candies as marshmallows, cream centers, nougats, and meringues. Here again the industry prefers the frozen to the shell eggs, since they make a better product.

There are two other industries which are helping to increase the market for preserved eggs. One is the noodle industry. The Federal Food and Drug law says that egg noodles should contain at least 5½ per cent of the solid materials of eggs. A large proportion of whole egg material is also needed to give the noodles the right color. And then, there are the ice cream manufacturers. They aren't using eggs of any kind to a great extent now. But, since it has been found that eggs do improve ice cream, there's a possibility that this will be a market for frozen eggs in the future.

As I told you, there are some products in which you can use either frozen or dried eggs. But there are others which require the powdered form. Among these are doughnut flours, meringue powders, and, to a certain extent, baking powder. It is also used in confections.

It's always interesting to look into the reasons for the changes that take place in our methods of producing and marketing food products. To understand the reasons for the growth of this frozen and dried egg industry you have to start with the reasons for food preservation of any kind. In the first place, we want to save up fruit, vegetables, meat, and so on, in seasons when we have a surplus, for the time when there will be a shortage. In the second place, today we have the problem of shipping food products to cities and to other sections of the country, or even the world. We have to have some way of getting it there in good condition.

Well, of course, these are just some general reasons that apply to food preservation of any kind. So Mr. Potts went into some of the special conditions responsible for this growing egg-preserving industry.

Egg preservation is an ancient art. Your ancestors knew about it hundreds of years ago. It's these new methods for drying and freezing the eggs, however, which are putting it on such a large industrial basis. But even at that, the frozen and dried eggs would have to show some advantages over eggs preserved in the shell in order to become popular. So it was some of these advantages that Mr. Potts went into with me.

As I told you, some manufacturers want yolks; some, whites; and others, the mixed eggs. When they buy shell eggs they have to take the entire egg and then dispose of the yolk, if the yolk happens to be what they don't want. But when they get frozen or dried eggs, they can take the yolk, the white, or the mixed egg, as they choose.

Hauling and storing are two other important points. Shell eggs weigh more and take up a great deal more space than those which have been broken out and dried or frozen. Also dried and frozen are less perishable than shell eggs and their market price is generally more stable. Therefore, from the standpoint of the individual baker or confectioner, eggs in tins are increasing in popularity and the demand for eggs in this form is quite likely to increase. This fact, however, should not be a disappointment to producers because it would tend to increase the quantity of eggs used and thereby make possible the development of a larger egg industry.

When I say "standard" I imagine that you wonder. You wonder, for instance, what kind of eggs are used for freezing and powdering. Doesn't this give a good chance for an unscrupulous man to mix up a few spoiled, or nearly spoiled, eggs with his product?

Well, this very thing was done a few years ago. And it still might be done today--- and got away with--- if it weren't for one thing. That's the sharp eye of your State and Federal pure food officials.

Right in that connection I might tell you a little story. The government brought up a case a few years ago against one of the largest of the frozen-egg manufacturers. He had been using bad eggs---eggs that are known as "rots" and "spots." The government inspector found this out by making some chemical and bacteriological examinations.

When the case was brought up in court, the manufacturer testified that he had been using perfectly sound eggs. To prove his claim, he brought along some of the cake that had been made from these eggs. The jury was given some of it to sample. It looked all right and smelled like cake should smell.

But the government officials still had a little trick up their sleeves which the manufacturer hadn't thought of. They turned the cake over to government chemists who heated it in an oven right there in the court room. Then they turned it over to the jury again. The government

won its case. The explanation is, that you can't smell rotten eggs in the cake so long as the cake is cold. But when you heat it--- that gives away the secret.

Now, your government inspectors don't just sit around waiting for a piece of cake to be heated and tested. They inspect the eggs while they are still in the cans. They go to a plant or warehouse where the eggs are being frozen or stored, take the lid off of a can, and bore into the center of the frozen eggs with a long-bitted drill. As they bore, the friction warms the eggs and if there are any bad ones in that can, the odor gives them away.

You must remember, a can of frozen eggs is worth several dollars. Two or three bad eggs will make an entire can worthless. And if there are bad cans in the stock, the inspectors will condemn the entire supply. Manufacturers have learned this by experience. They now know that it's costly business to break out bad eggs, freeze them up in cans, and hold them for sale. When they get a shipment of eggs now, they break dozens of them separately in dishes, smell the eggs, and reject them if they find any bad ones. As a result, we are getting a high-quality grade of frozen and canned eggs on the American market today.

The Food and Drug men tell another interesting story of a man who had a novel scheme for selling bad eggs for food purposes. Since rotten eggs have a legitimate use in tanning, he organized the Blank Tanners' Egg Yolk company. He bought rotten eggs in New York and shipped them to Boston, labeled "Rots and Spots for Tanners' Use Only."

But the Food and Drug inspectors got suspicious. They boarded a boat one night which was loaded with eggs that this man was shipping. After they had found that the eggs were rotten, they made tiny holes in them, injected a certain fluid, and sealed the holes with wax. This fluid was colorless, but when a certain other colorless material is added, the eggs turn pink.

Well, these eggs went on to the Boston plant of the Blank Tanners' Egg Yolk Company. But the inspectors were close on their trail. They saw these eggs delivered to the plant. But here's something else they saw. The next day wagons came away from the plant, loaded with cans of frozen eggs. The inspectors followed these wagons to bakeries, where the eggs were to have been used in baking cakes. The government men added a little of this colorless fluid I was telling you about, and sure enough the eggs turned pink. These were the same eggs that they had examined in the ship. Needless to say, that put an end to the man's business.

###

ANNOUNCEMENT: Your Farm Reporter in Washington has been telling you about the dried and frozen egg business--a growing industry in this country. He also told you about what the government is doing to insure that bad eggs are not used in the food products that you buy. This is one of the programs presented daily except Saturday and Sunday over _____ through the cooperation of the U. S. Department of Agriculture.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Radio Service

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

34o

YOUR FARM REPORTER AT WASHINGTON. Thursday, January 22, 1931.

Federal Farm Board Interview No. 4: The Wool Situation.

ANNOUNCEMENT: Your farm reporter at Washington will report to us about wool -- about the wool market situation and our new National Wool Marketing Corporation. He got his information direct from wool specialists of the Federal Farm Board ----- Now he will pass it along to us ---- Well, Mr. Reporter? --------

****

Yes, Mr. J. M. Coon, of the wool division of the Federal Farm Board, has been telling me about some of the recent developments, in the National Wool Marketing Corporation and the prospects for bigger wool sales, in the near future.

Mr. Coon says it is pretty well understood that mill stocks of wool are low. He figures that it is just a question of increasing wool consumption to bolster up the whole wool trade.

Another thing which adds confidence to him in this viewpoint, is that there is very little foreign wool coming into this country now. Wool importers have reached new low levels. The National Wool Marketing Corporation, he says, has got to sell wool at a price to keep out foreign wools. But the fact that we are still an importing nation on wool lands encouragement in the present situation. It is pretty certain that if there is any demand at all, stocks will begin to move.

Mr. Coon notes that the medium grades of wool have begun to pick up. Most of the demand recently has been for the fine wools, and he takes the bigger demand for the medium grades as a happy sign.

At the last meeting of the National Wool Growers in December, the growers showed a fine feeling toward their National organization. They all seemed to realize, Mr. Coon says, that the wool markets are depressed and slow, so they are not expecting the impossible from the National Wool Marketing Corporation. For the most part, they have shown their willingness to support the National during the coming year.

And that is not just a feeling of Mr. Coon's. That willingness is shown by the larger number of pre-shearing advances. Those pre-shearing advances are being made at the rate of fifty cents to one dollar a head; according to the section of the country. That is, according to the class and quality of the wool, which is largely a matter of the section of the country in which it is grown.

Those pre-shearing advances are being made in all the "Territory States". That is, they are being made in Texas and all the States West of the Missouri River.

Wherever it is practical, pre-shearing advances are also being made in the fleece wool States. In our fleece wool states of the central and eastern parts of the country, most farm flocks are small. Because the handling of the pre-shearing advances would be too expensive for the small producers, few growers in the fleece states have asked for them.

Mr. Coon points out other indications of the strength of the new National Wool Marketing Corporation. Associations of wool growers in Indiana and Wisconsin have been accepted as member units to market their wool through the National.

That makes 28 cooperatives now banded together in this country-wide organization owned and controlled by ranchmen and farmers.

Mr. Coon says it is hoped that as the Corporation builds up some of the cooperatives in the western States will be combined into larger regional organizations. But where we have farm flocks in the fleece wool states, he thinks that more contact can be made with the individual farmers through their own local State organizations. For that reason, he holds that the advantages of combination into large regional organizations are not as pronounced in the fleece wool States, as in the "Territory States."

Another interesting development in this selling of wool, is the recent planning by the National of a concentration point in Chicago. A warehouse will be operated in Chicago to take care of the wool from Illinois, and Wisconsin growers and other groups which it may prove feasible to benefit in this way.

As you all know, although wool is clipped from the backs of sheep in every State in the Union and a large part of our annual clip comes from our Western States, practically 85 per cent of all the wool used in this country is disposed of within four hundred miles of Boston. The wool from all over the country goes right into New England, and the biggest part of it right into Boston. Boston is by long odds our largest wool market. Philadelphia is a slow second. There is also a little sold on our West Coast.

That is the reason the new National Corporation has its headquarters at Boston, and is concentrating practically all its efforts in New England. And it is now selling wool right along.

However, water and rail rates are very important in this matter of moving wool. And, Mr. Coon tells me the experts in the National are studying freight rates in order to cut down the freight bills wherever possible.

That seems to be the idea in establishing a concentration point in Chicago for wool from nearby States. From Chicago, situated as it is on the Lake, it will be possible to move wool processed at that point to other points in the country either by rail or water.

It is fully expected, Mr. Coon says, that all the fleece wool cooperatives will show a considerable increase in the wool tonnage they will handle this year.

While the National Corporation is holding the support of its members in this trying time, and the member associations are increasing their tonnage, and more coops are lined up under this centralized sales agency, the United States Department of Agriculture is cooperating with the National in training present and future wool producers as to the grade and quality of wools.

But while we are on this subject of wool, let's not forget that the National Wool Marketing Corporation also handles mohair. In fact, it handles well over 85 per cent of all the mohair produced in this country.

The National, Mr. Coon says, is investigating all possible outlets for mohair, and some sales are being made at satisfactory prices.

With mohair, as with wool, it is a matter of increasing the demand. Mr. Coon claims that no material can compete in wearing quality with mohair, and that mohair prices are down now where they should be attractive to everybody.

Mill stocks are known to be low, and when inventories are taken the feel is, that there will be a certain amount of mohair sales shortly. All in all, Mr. Coon views the situation as offering some encouragement to producers.

****

ANNOUNCEMENT: Your farm reporter at Washington has just reported to you some of the recent development in marketing wool and mohair, as outlined to him by Mr. J. M. Coon of the Federal Farm Board. A description of the set-up and accomplishments of the National Wool Marketing Corporation can be had in Federal Farm Board Bulletin No. 3 on "Farmers Build Their Marketing Machinery." You can get a copy from the Director of Information, of the Federal Farm Board. This report comes to you through the cooperation of Station ------- with the United States Department of Agriculture.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Radio Service

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

3 Yo

YOUR FARM REPORTER AT WASHINGTON Friday, January 23, 1931

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

Speaking Time:

Dairy Interview No. 72: LOOKING AHEAD IN DAIRYING

ANNOUNCEMENT: And now here is Your Farm Reporter at Washington, again, fresh from a visit with an old friend----Dr. J. C. McDowell, veteran dairy husbandman of the Bureau of Dairy Industry in the United States Department of Agriculture. The New Year is still new, and so Your Reporter's topic for today seems very appropriate to the season. He reports his interview on "Looking Ahead in Dairying." Mr. Reporter. ...

- - - -

Do you remember the words of Patrick Henry, spoken on this very question of looking ahead?

"I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience; I know of no way of judging the future but by the past."

Now, Dr. McDowell believes that in looking ahead in dairying we can do no better than to take our cue from Patrick Henry.

Well, what does the past of dairying indicate as to the future?

First of all, suppose we go WAY back into the history of the dairy business in this country. Go back to 1850. According to Dr. McDowell's records, in that year the country boasted of 278 milk cows to each one thousand people---more than one cow to every four persons. At the present time, there are only 186 cows per thousand people---which is less than one to every FIVE persons.

And yet, of course the fact is that although we have fewer cows per person, we have more milk per person. In this 80-year span, average production per cow increased from slightly more than 1,400 pounds in 1850

to at least 4,600 pounds at the present time.

In other words, while the number of cows per person was decreasing around 50 per cent, average production per cow increased more than 200 per cent.

Now, relying on the lamp of experience, Dr. McDowell says this:

"There is every reason to believe," he told me, "that as time goes on we will be able to supply the increasing population of the United States with plenty of milk and milk products---not with more cows per thousand people, but with greater production per cow.

"For that matter, it is entirely possible that we may do it with FEWER cows."

You know, in the last 10 years, the average production of milk per cow has increased about 1,000 pounds. But Dr. McDowell declares this is still far too low.

And as proof, he cites the experience of farmers in Dairy Herd-Improvement Associations. In 1929, cows on test in these associations produced, on the average, almost 7,500 pounds of milk and 296 pounds of butterfat.

Dr. McDowell believes that it is "well within the range of possibility" --- as he puts it --- for the average production of the whole country to at least come up to this level.

Well, right here you might ask, "Wouldn't this give us an oversupply of dairy products?" Wouldn't this be jumping from the frying pan of inefficient production into the FIRE of OVERproduction?

The answer comes, "NO" --- NOT if the improvement is brought about gradually, as it will be; and if population continues to gain at somewhere near its present rate for a number of years; and of course, if per capita consumption of dairy products keeps on increasing as it has.

But you may also ask, IS there actually reason to believe that consumption per person WILL increase in the near future?

This is a very important "IF."

Well, again, let's apply Patrick Henry's rule, and judge the near future by the immediate past.

According to the figures assembled by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, per capita consumption of milk increased from 43 gallons in 1920 to 58 gallons in 1929. And here's what has happened in the consumption of other dairy products in that same 10-year period.

Butter consumption per person jumped from 14.7 pounds to 17.6 pounds; cheese from 3.5 pounds to 4.6 pounds; condensed and evaporated milk from 10.17 pounds to 16.58 pounds; ice cream from 2.46 gallons to an even 3 gallons.

Furthermore, there seem to be very good reasons why the American people SHOULD eat more dairy products. For example, Dr. E. V. McCollum of Johns Hopkins University---famous scientist and a leading authority on foods and health --- says that per capita consumption of dairy products ought to be at least 50 per cent above what it is now. That is, from the standpoint of our national health and well-being.

However, the point is---assuming that per capita consumption and total consumption do steadily increase--- that it is up to us to supply this new demand, not through more cows, but through better cows; that is, through higher production per cow. Now, can it be done?

Well, if you want convincing proof that it can, all you have to do is to turn to the records of Dairy Herd-Improvement Associations.

But now, let's make some very recent history. There is the year 1930---gone, but not forgotten. It was a hard year for all farmers, dairy farmers included. But there's no question but that it was a much harder year for the man with a low-producing herd than it was for the man who owned a herd of high producers.

Well, if we guide our feet by the lamp of experience, Dr. McDowell feels sure there are special reasons for starting this particular New Year right.

"Why not begin this year with determination to put your herd on a business basis?" he asked. "My suggestion would be to prepare immediately for the 1931 campaign---and make it a DEFINITE campaign. I mean, among other things, keeping records of production, records of feed cost, and records of income, on each and every cow in the herd. And then, send all unprofitable cows to the butcher promptly, as soon as you find they are unprofitable.

"But don't STOP there. Very likely the UNprofitable cow needs company on her way to the butcher's. Send along with her all other cows which do not return what you consider a REASONABLE profit. One of the best resolutions I can think of, is to keep no cow unless she brings in not simply a return, but a <u>satisfactory</u> return on investment."

Of course, just <u>how</u> high production must be to put a cow on a profit-bearing basis, will vary considerably on different farms and in different parts of the country.

However, in a COMMERCIAL dairy herd, Dr. McDowell believes that 300 pounds of butterfat a year per cow is a fair goal to shoot at.

If that production yields a profit, well and good, he says. But if it doesn't, don't stop. Keep right on culling.

At this time there are already around 28,000 herds on test in the Dairy Herd-Improvement Associations---and their average production is only 4 pounds below this 300 pound level.

And there are at present, also, more than 10,000 members of the Honarary Guild of Gopatis.(pronounce Go-pay'-tis) As you know, a member of this society must be the owner or manager of a herd of 5 or more cows, whose average production is at least 300 pounds of butterfat in a year.

Well, Dr. McDowell believes that anyone can do what these 10,000 farmers have done.

Of course, such improvement requires more than culling. First of all it requires intelligent feeding; and then, to push your herd up into the 300,400, or 450-pound class, it requires intelligent breeding. Good feeding is always necessary.

In any event, here's a suggestion. Why not set a production GOAL for your herd this year, and work hard to reach it? And then, each year, set that goal a little higher.

- - - -

ANNOUNCEMENT: You have been listening to Your Farm Reporter at Washington. Your Reporter has asked me to remind you of several bulletins which give detailed information on the questions brought up in today's talk. One is "Dairy Herd Improvement Associations and Stories the Records Tell," Farmers' Bulletin No. 1604. "Dairy Herd Improvement," is Farmers' Bulletin No. 1532; "Care and Management of Dairy Cows" is Farmers' Bulletin No. 1470; and "Feeding Dairy Cows," is Farmers' Bulletin No. 1626. If you will write either to Station_____or to the U.S. Department of Agriculture in Washington, D. C., copies of these publications will be sent to you free of charge, as long as the supply lasts.

- - - -

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Radio Service
OFFICE OF INFORMATION

YOUR FARM REPORTER AT WASHINGTON. Monday, January 26, 1931.

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

Speaking Time: 10 Minutes. All Regions.

THE VITAMIN CONTENT OF GENERAL FARM MEATS

OPENING ANNOUNCEMENT: Every Monday morning Your Washington Farm Reporter personally interviews some livestock specialist or scientist in the United States Department of Agriculture and then broadcasts the results of that interview to you livestock producers out in the field or wherever you may happen to be. The subject for today is the vitamin content of general farm meats. All right, Mr. Reporter -------

--ooOoo--

Hello, folks. I want to talk to you for a little while today about some of the interesting things I saw on a recent trip through one of the many scientific laboratories in the United States Department of Agriculture.

This particular laboratory I'm going to talk about today is in what they call the BIOCHEMIC DIVISION of the Bureau of Animal Industry. By boiling the word biochemic down to common language we find that it means a chemical study of biological or animal products including meats produced from the slaughter of general farm animals.

On entering this laboratory the other morning I was met with the odor of ether, very similar to the odor I recall so well when I lost my tonsils.

"Take this chair, right here," invited Ralph Hoagland, who is in charge of the laboratory. He's been in Uncle Sam's services for more than 20 years, and is an expert at mixing chemicals and making a patient feel at ease while he talks on the many subjects connected with the interesting work he is carrying on for the benefit of men and women back on the farm, and for humanity in general.

Getting ready to defend myself as I would in any hospital where I wouldn't have the slightest idea of what was going on, I thought of my questions as the only means of defense and opened up with the following:

"Say, Mr. Hoagland, what are you going to do with the powder that that man is mixing over there by the window?"

"Feed it to rats," came his jovial reply.

"Well," I said, "what are you putting ether in it for? Do rats like ether?"

"Not especially," he answered, "but you see, ether helps to distribute the fats in the feed and thereby enables each rat to get a ration that is thoroughly and evenly mixed. That is very important in the feeding of rats, farm animals, or even people. Of course, I don't mean that people ought to eat ether--- they should not, but people and animals all seem to do better when fed a well-balanced ration. And that's what livestock producers are interested in---- in seeing that animals get a ration that will promote economic and profitable growth and development."

I'm sure most of you listeners have heard of, read about, and perhaps tasted of those inimitable sugar-cured hams. Commercial packers use sugar in getting a part of this sugar-cured flavor. Farmers do likewise. Previous to the World War we had plenty of cane and beet sugar and never thought of using anything else in the sugar curing of certain meats. They found, according to Mr. Hoagland, that corn sugar could be used successfully in the sugar curing of meats.

While they were experimenting with these various sugars--- they became interested in vitamins. At that time comparatively little was known about the distribution of vitamins in meats and meat products.

One step led to another, and today you can find out a lot about the VITAMIN content of general farm meats from this biochemic laboratory simply because they got interested in the study of that project while hunting for something else. I'm told that many great discoveries are made while people are searching for something entirely different. Historians say that Columbus was looking for a new route to India when he stumbled on to a new country we now call America.

Mr. Hoagland and his laboratory staff of white-aproned workers have studied three of the well-known vitamins of today. Vitamin A is present in meat, but not in sufficient quantities to make it of special interest at the present time. Liver and kidneys, however, are very good sources of this vitamin. We'll now pass over vitamin A and stop at the next one which is called vitamin B.

Vitamin B, according to Mr. Hoagland and other leading authorities, is the vitamin which prevents the disease in man known as beri-beri. A deficiency of vitamin B also causes animals to make only a stunted growth and, of course, lowers their vitaility and resistance.

All the edible parts of cattle, sheep, and hogs were studied in the biochemic laboratory to find out if they contained vitamin B.

The lean meat of hogs was found to be one of the best sources of vitamin B.

Mr. Hoagland says that the amount of vitamin B in lean pork is not materially destroyed by usual methods of cooking.

Vitamin G is one of the vitamins still under discussion by many authorities. This is the vitamin used in some sections of the country to fight pellagra, but Mr.Hoagland said he wanted to confine his remarks to the growth-promoting qualities of vitamin G. Animals need plenty of vitamin G to make ample growth and development. That, of course, is important in the economic production of farm animals.

While lean beef, pork and mutton are good sources of vitamin G, the liver and kidneys of general farm animals are even richer in this vitamin.

Therefore, in summarizing our knowledge of this subject we find that pork, liver and kidneys are splendid sources of vitamin B. Lean beef, pork, and mutton are good sources while the liver and kidneys of these animals are excellent sources of vitamin G.

Mr. Hoagland cautioned me to be sure that you listeners understood that there are plenty of other sources of vitamins B and G aside from meats, but that general farm meats do contain quite a bit of these two important vitamins and that this should be taken into consideration in planning an adequate diet.

When something worth while comes from these experiments it is written up in the form of a bulletin or some other publication and offered to you people throughout the country. For instance, if you want information about the vitamin B content of meat ask for REPRINT NO. A-128, and if you want information about the vitamin G content of meat ask for REPRINT NO. A-138. That A indicates that the work comes from the Bureau of Animal Industry and the number is the key by which it is known.

I mention this trip and what I saw in one of the laboratories of the Biochemic Division of the Bureau of Animal Industry on this occasion to drive home the fact that Uncle Sam has hundreds of competent men and women working all the time to help you people.

Some of these days I'm going back and take another look at this and some of the other laboratories in the United States Department of Agriculture and then tell you some more about what's going on back in the trenches. Until then, good-bye, and good luck.

--00000--

CLOSING ANNOUNCEMENT: You have been listening to Your Farm Reporter in one of his regular livestock programs broadcast from Station _____in co-operation with the Federal Department of Agriculture. If you want information on vitamins B and G in meats, ask for REPRINTS NO. A-128 and A-138. You can get them from this station or from the United States Department of Agriculture in Washington, D. C.

--ooOoo--

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Radio Service

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

YOUR FARM REPORTER AT WASHINGTON. Tuesday, January 27, 1931.

Crops and Soils Interview No. 4: The Outlook Report.

ANNOUNCEMENT: "Coming events cast their shadow before." Today your farm reporter at Washington reports to us a coming event of importance to every farmer in this country. Even now, specialists in all branches of the farm business are in the white heat of concentration, figuring out a sound basis for our use in planning production this year ---- You tell them about it, Mr. Reporter.

******

It won't be long now ----- just a few days.

Then comes the big report of the year -- the Agricultural Outlook for 1931.

That report has come to mark a red-letter day for all forward-looking farmers.

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics, tells me this year's national outlook, which will be the ninth of these annual reports, will be issued February 2.

Covering as it will, forty or more crops, with information on them from all angles, it is the most comprehensive survey of agricultural conditions and prospects to be had anywhere.

Thousands of farmers have learned to look to these outlook reports for the information needed in making their plans for the year. It is always important to get the facts, and to look ahead, and plan production with an eye to what markets are likely to be, and not what they were last season. But I venture to say, that careful planning of farm production was never more important than today. For that reason, this year's Outlook should be especially helpful. Some folks, however, don't seem to realize what a remarkable thing we have in our Agricultural Outlook Report. Maybe I didn't myself. I learned how this report is prepared.

Let's take a little peep behind the scenes.

The final outlook conference is even now in session at Washington whipping the National Outlook Report into final shape for release to the whole country next week. There you see the chairmen of the various outlook committees in the great Bureau of Agricultural Economics. There are the representatives from other Bureaus in the United States Department of Agriculture. There, too, are representatives from the extension and research staffs of our State Colleges of Agriculture from one end of the country to the other.

Each committee makes a preliminary report. The training, and knowledge and practical experience of all the experts is focused upon each preliminary report as it is brought up. They have charts there showing the basic facts of our economic situation for each crop.

Practical experience and first-hand knowledge of the facts about each branch of our farming industry are right now being brought to bear on the preparation of our Outlook Report. Besides the committee on wheat, and livestock, and tobacco, and other different crops, there are also other special committees of experts on domestic demand, and foreign demand, and farm equipment, and farm credit. In other words, those men consider the outlook from all angles. The facts from all angles will be combined in that final outlook report which comes out Ground Hog Day, next Monday.

But the work they are doing now is just the final step. Each of those preliminary reports represents intensive work for the past several weeks by a committee.

Every person in the big Bureau of Agricultural Economics who has some special knowledge of the economic conditions connected with a particular commodity is called on to form part of the committee for that product. It doesn't make any difference what phase of the work he may ordinarily be working on. The important thing at this time of the year is the Outlook Report.

As I say, those experts have been working for the past several weeks. In addition, specialists from the other Bureaus of the Department, such as the Bureau of Animal Industry, and Dairy Industry, and Plant Industry, and from the staff of the Federal Farm Board also sit on those committees, and help prepare the Outlook reports.

Let me just take one of those committees as a sample of the others. Say, we take the committee that prepared the preliminary report on sheep and wool.

On that committee, there was a sheep production specialist from the Bureau of Animal Industry. Then there was another specialist from the division of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics that has charge of reporting livestock markets, and with grading, and standardizing, and marketing investigations on meat, and livestock and wool. On that same committee, was the specialist in direct charge of our market news service on sheep. Another committee member was a livestock marketing research specialist. The expert in charge of wool standards and marketing studies was also on that committee. Then there was the man in charge of livestock estimates. And a field livestock estimator for the range States. And the statistician who specializes on foreign sheep and wool figures. And one who works on prices of lambs and wool. And others who have been out in the range country taking part in farm management studies.

That is just one committee handling one of the forty crops and classes of livestock. But you see, the experts on that committee are men who have been in constant touch in their regular, daily work with some phase of the situation.

When the committee met those men took up the market situation of the year just completed. They considered the prospective supply situation. They discussed the probable demand situation. And then what prices are likely to be and do. And even what farmers are likely to do in the light of the facts.

Of course, you may not be able to tell what some eccentric farmer neighbor of yours will do. But that's where records come in handy. Knowing what large numbers of folks have done under similar circumstances, it is often easy to figure about what they will do -- at least, what most of them will do.

You might think there would be danger of these specialists on one crop seeing the situation too much from their own special viewpoint. But that has been guarded against in these Outlook Reports. In preparing the hog report, for instance, the domestic demand, and the foreign demand, and the corn situation, and the cattle situation all had to be taken into consideration by the committee, so at least one member of the committees on those subjects was also on the hog committee. And at least one member of the hog committee was on each of those other committees. By that interlocking arrangement of experts, it is made certain that the report on one crop will be prepared with full recognition of the facts as to related products.

In the main the national Outlook Report will present the national rather than the local point of view. But it will be supplemented with regional and local information worked out in each State. Remember, the national Outlook Report will be issued Monday, February 2.

*****

ANNOUNCEMENT: Your farm reporter at Washington has just told us something of how the national Agricultural Outlook Report is now being prepared by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. This report comes to you from Station ------ in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture. Keep a sharp look out for the Outlook Report.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Radio Service
OFFICE OF INFORMATION

YOUR FARM REPORTER AT WASHINGTON. Wednesday, January 28, 1931.

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

Speaking Time: 10 Minutes. All Regions.

FEEDING CHICKENS

CLOSING ANNOUNCEMENT: Ladies and gentlemen, at this time Station_____ presents one of the regular Washington Farm Reporter programs broadcast in cooperation with the Federal Department of Agriculture. The subject for to-day is FEEDING CHICKENS. All right Mr. Reporter, let's go.

--oOo--

Hello everybody. I hope you are all feeling fine today because I'm going to talk to you for a little while about fried chicken, chicken dumpling, chicken pie, and what have you. In order to get the most from a program of this kind you need to be feeling mighty good and slightly hungry.

I want to open up today by asking you this question----What's better, along in the early spring, than a nice, plump, juicy broiler cooked to perfection and served warm on a nice brown piece of hot toast?

Perhaps there are some of you who prefer the "pully-bone" of a nice fried chicken, others of you who call for chicken pie, another crowd waiting for a pot of steaming hot dumplings, and still others who prefer chickens that lay enough eggs to keep the automobile running, especially during the summer visiting and picnicking season.

Now folks, it takes gasoline to make my automobile go and I'm reliably informed that it takes FEED----plenty of it and of the right kinds to make chickens grow. Therefore, I'm going to talk to you on the subject of FEEDING CHICKENS. I got my information from Farmers' Bulletin No.1541-F called FEEDING CHICKENS, and here's how it came about.

Every Wednesday morning I'm in the habit of having a chicken conversation with Mr. A. R. Lee poultry specialist of the United States Bureau of Animal Industry.

Well, on the morning of this particular interview I'm talking about today I arrived just in time to see Mr. Lee's coat tail going around the corner. He looked to me as though he was starting a long and important journey, and, as fortune tellers often say, toward the EAST. I succeeded in bringing him to a complete standstill with one of my country "whooppees", and learned that he was on his way to New York to help look after Uncle Sam's poultry exhibit at the Madison Square Garden Poultry Show.

"You're after an interview on feeding chickens, aren't you?" was Mr. Lee's business-like question after we had come face to face in the little old dingy hallway.

"You knocked a home run" I answered. "That's exactly what I want."

"Very well," he remarked with a kind of a Yankee twinkle in his eyes, "You'll find the interview on my desk. Use as much as you like. Good-bye and good luck," and with that he was gone, and I was left standing in the little old hallway I have already described.

What do you suppose I found on Mr. Lee's desk? A copy of Farmers' Bulletin No. 1541-F called FEEDING CHICKENS. Dr. Morley A. Jull, in charge of Uncle Sam's poultry office, and Mr. Lee wrote this bulletin jointly. It is based on actual feeding experiments at the Government experiment farm at Beltsville, Maryland, and on thousands of other poultry farms throughout the country.

I know from the requests that have come in for this bulletin that thousands of you poultry raisers already have a copy of it on your shelves. You may be interested in learning that more than 300,000 copies of this bulletin have already been printed and----now get this----that 282,000 copies have already been distributed throughout the country. A lot of you listeners have asked for this bulletin, because it is only mailed out on request. I'm glad you have asked for this bulletin on feeding chickens because it contains plenty of practical information for the man or woman interested in the economic feeding of poultry flocks on the average farm or on the commercial farm with thousands of birds.

There are lots of chickens in the country at the present time and poultry and egg prices haven't been anything to brag about for several months. Under such conditions it's perhaps wise to stop, look, listen, and do a little planning before you begin to count the profits from the 1931 poultry crop. I suppose we can call it a crop.

Listen to the opening statement of the bulletin I'm talking about. It says: "Efficient feeding practices are necessary to make poultry raising most profitable and to produce the best quality of products."

In other words, feeding plays an important part in the production of a chicken whether that bird is to grace your dinner table or to lay eggs for the benefit of your bank account.

"Feed," says the bulletin, "is the most important cost factor in raising poultry. Therefore, the selection of feeds and the method of feeding are very important matters."

You know folks, I can't talk very long without saying something about my old automobile. When everything is all right----that old car is as good as any gas wagon that ever turned a wheel----but just let something go wrong or get out of whack----and bingo------she's as dead as a doornail so far as hauling me around is concerned.

My car does the best work when there is the right balance between gasoline and air; between engine oil in the crankcase and water in the radiator. And, of course, sufficient air in the tires. When one of these factors drops out that breaks the balance and while the old boat may limp along----she can't deliver the goods in a satisfactory manner.

According to this bulletin I'm talking about there must be a proper balance of feeds in the economic and profitable feeding of chickens. Especially should there be a good balance between protein, carbohydrates, minerals, and vitamins.

A chicken that receives an improperly balanced ration is comparable to my automobile when it receives an improperly balanced diet of gasoline and air through the carburetor. Both will perform in a half-hearted way but both have lost that pep which produces that school girl complexion and results at the end of the trip.

I don't want you listeners to misunderstand this talk. I'm not an agent of any kind and I'm not selling a thing. I'm simply calling your attention to this bulletin on feeding chickens because under present conditions of plenty of chickens on farms and low prices for poultry products it may be necessary for some of you to do a little thinking and planning relative to your 1931 poultry crop.

If you are in that class or if you want additional information on feeding chickens----I believe you will profit by reading this bulletin.

The bulletin opens with a discussion on what a chicken does with the feed it eats. This is followed by a short discussion on the requirements of a satisfactory ration. Do you know how much protein, how much fat, carbohydrates, and minerals a chicken needs? The bulletin answers these and many other questions relative to feeding market poultry, laying hens, broilers, fryers, roasters, and discusses the use of green feeds, milk, and minerals in the ration.

The bulletin contains 22 pages with many illustrations, and 14 feeding rations already made into a usable table.

Let me close by urging you people who have this bulletin to get it down from the shelf and read it over carefully and make it help you meet the present poultry situation through a better system of feeding.

For those of you who have not received this bulletin let me suggest that you write for a copy. Ask for Farmers' Bulletin No.1541-F, FEEDING CHICKENS. You can get it by addressing your request to Station_____ or by writing to the United States Department of Agriculture in Washington, D. C.

--oOo--

CLOSING ANNOUNCEMENT: Ladies and gentlemen, you have been listening to Your Washington Farm Reporter program broadcast from Station_____ in cooperation with the Federal Department of Agriculture. If you want a copy of Farmers' Bulletin No.1541-F called FEEDING CHICKENS send your request to Station_____ or write to the United States Department of Agriculture in Washington, D.C.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Radio Service
OFFICE OF INFORMATION

3yo

YOUR FARM REPORTER AT WASHINGTON — Thursday, January 29, 1931.

Federal Farm Board Interview No. 5: — Cooperation Among Tobacco Growers.

ANNOUNCEMENT: At this time each week your farm reporter at Washington reports to us about the cooperative movement among farmers. The cooperative marketing division of the Federal Farm Board gives him the information. This week the division's tobacco specialist has told him about the recent developments in tobacco marketing ----- Well, Mr. Reporter? ------

******

Mr. William Collins, in charge of the tobacco section of the Federal Farm Board, was the specialist who outlined to me some of these recent developments.

It seems from what he says that the little new South Carolina association is coming through its first year in good shape. Growers in North Carolina and Virginia have laid plans for two tobacco associations in each of those States. The Burley growers of Kentucky and neighboring states are about ready to start up their association again when the time is ripe, with that liberal optional contract, which is something new in tobacco marketing. Georgia growers now have a series of meetings in progress to organize a new co-op in Georgia. The Georgia Association is also using one of those new optional contracts.

However, Mr. Collins warns co-op members against that quick-sale fever, which has done so much damage in tobacco associations in the past. He says, members will have to learn to see marketing from a long-time viewpoint. They must realize that an association can't be made a howling success over night.

The Federal Farm Board has made a careful survey of the new South Carolina Association, and found that, so far, from a strictly business stand-point, it is in excellent shape. The prospects are good. If the members will be content to give the management time to sell, there is every indication that the South Carolina Association will sell its tobacco at fair prices, considering general conditions.

The South Carolina Association just began operation last August with about 5,000 members and a sign-up of about 17,000,000 pounds of tobacco. That's very small for a tobacco association. A lot of people thought it was foolish to start up with so little. They figured the expenses would be prohibitive.

And Mr. Collins says that is the very minimum for a tobacco co-op. Probably no other association could start on that little. But when that South Carolina association was started, it looked like it would be worth while to get going. Market prices were low. There was a big demand. It appeared that conditions later might not be so favorable, if the chance to

get going was neglected.

Another reason was that the tobacco section in South Carolina was very concentrated in ten adjoining counties within a short radius of the town of Florence. Mr. Collins doubts whether such a small association would work in other places where the volume is more scattered. But the fine record with its 1930 crop, he says does show that you don't necessarily have to have a big volume, if local conditions are favorable.

The grading by this co-op was done by government graders. And as far as the physical handling of the tobacco is concerned, it has been done at a reasonable cost so far.

The attitude of the big manufacturing companies has been friendly. But in the last analysis, Mr. Collins declares, you can't expect one little association to upset the whole market system or sell as quickly as members would like to have the selling done. You must remember, that the old market system started way back in colonial times, is still running. You can hardly expect the buyers to change all their old methods of buying just for the convenience of the association.

However, he says, he can see no reason why the South Carolina Association should not make a nice record this year, and hopes that next year it will be able to increase its membership and volume so as to do a more economical and profitable job of selling its tobacco.

Now, as to the prospects in other States.

Virginia and North Carolina are both following much the same organization plan as that of the South Carolina Association. However, before launching their campaigns to set up an Association, a series of educational meetings was held under the leadership of representatives of the Federal Farm Board, and representatives of the Extension Departments of the States and Vocational Teachers. The idea of that program was to bring to the tobacco growers as much information as possible about production and marketing of tobacco from their own standpoint.

Following that series, the growers decided to organize and appointed organization committees to work out definite plans. In each State, it was decided to have two separate Associations. In Virginia, it was decided to have a co-op for dark tobacco growers and another for light tobacco growers. In North Carolina, it was decided to have one for the old or western tobacco belt, and another for the eastern belt. The dividing line in each case is the type of tobacco grown.

The Virginia and North Carolina Associations have adopted contracts, and will begin operation with the 1931 crop, provided they get big enough sign-ups this spring.

In case there is not enough volume contracted to justify organizing for this crop, the agreement is that the contracts carry-over to the 1932 crop.

The situation of the Burley tobacco growers of Kentucky and adjoining States is considerably different, in that the Burley Association still exists, in nucleus form. It still has a Board of Directors, an office building, cash reserves, and the members of the Association own stock in warehouses which were bought and paid for while the cooperative was active. So it will be easier for the Burley growers to re-organize and begin again than it is for growers in other States.

Mr. Collins says that before the 1930 crop, the Burley growers in Kentucky got exercised over prices, and the directors of that quiescent co-op adopted a contract and made tentative arrangements for handling the tobacco should it be deemed necessary to start a pooling operation again.

That contract was unique, in that it embodied optional provisions whereby the member when he delivered his tobacco to the association could elect to have the association sell it for him at auction. In that case after it was sold, if the grower was dissatisfied, the contract provided that he could reject the sale, with the understanding that he could not sell elsewhere. His tobacco would then go into the pool and be sold by the Association along with other pooled tobacco in the usual way.

They made no attempt to get signers to the contract, but just had it ready. When the market opened, however, prices were fairly satisfactory and the Burley growers didn't think it necessary to start pooling operations this season.

In Georgia, however, the same sort of optional contract has been adopted, following a series of meeting of tobacco growers with Federal Farm Board representatives, in which it was decided to form a tobacco cooperative in Georgia. A campaign committee met near the middle of December and laid plans. Now Georgia growers are in the midst of a series of 35 meetings to put the organization across.

*****

ANNOUNCEMENT: Recent developments in tobacco growers cooperation have just been outlined to you by Mr. William Collins, tobacco specialist of the Federal Farm Board. This report was one of our series from your farm reporter at Washington, which Station------- presents in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Radio Service

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

YOUR FARM REPORTER AT WASHINGTON

Friday, January 30, 1931

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

Speaking time: 10 minutes

Dairy Interview: LOOKING BACK AT THE 1930 DAIRY MARKETS

ANNOUNCEMENT: And now Station____again presents Your Farm Reporter at Washington. Next week, you know, the U. S. Department of Agriculture will release its Agricultural Outlook Report for 1931. And so today, Your Farm Reporter is anticipating the look ahead by a look backward, over the year 1930. This being his day to report to dairy farmers, he's going to review, mainly, the 1930 behaviour of the butter markets. All right, Mr. Reporter...

****

Well, it seems that 1930 deserves to go down in history, not only as one of the most disappointing years, but as one of the most unruly, as far as the dairy markets are concerned.

At least, this is the impression I gathered in talking it over with Mr. Walter J. Venske, of the division of dairy and poultry products in the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

As Mr. Venske pointed out, the price level of the major dairy products was not only very low, but it was often very freakish. Prices went down, when, according to all rules of the game, they should have gone up; and what's more, they went up when tradition demanded that they go down.

You might say they were consistent only in being inconsistent; at any rate, their behaviour was "different" right from the very start.

For, in the first place, the price of butter, the basic dairy product, after the first of the year; but instead, it went through the first few weeks of 1930 on the DOWNgrade.

After that, it did rise a little bit. But instead of falling again, along in April----when production begins to go into high speed and prices ordinarily drop rather sharply---it CONTINUED to rise. In fact, they actually gained two cents.

However, this seems to have been just one of 1930's April Fool jokes. Anyway, prices of butter dropped sharply in May, and in June they dropped stil further, down to 33 cents.

This, you'll remember, was a low level for the year up to that time; in fact, it was the lowest price since June 1922. And so of course, it had its good, even if only temporary, effect. That is, buyers of butter, and storage operators, who had been very, very cautious, began to sit up and take notice. They began to buy at this low price, and butter moved into refrigerators fairly fast. Then, in addition to this, production during midsummer was exceptionally light.

So, all in all, it was only natural that prices should again pick up; which they did. You remember, in fact, that they advanced 4 cents during August--- another very unusual occurrence, since there is ordinarily very little, if any, price change at this time.

And then, of course, something else happened. The price level at this time---in August---was some 4 to 6 cents above the level of the heavy-producing months of May, June and July; and so, quite naturally, the owners of storage butter began to "work out" their stocks. Many of them preferred to sell at a reasonable profit, rather than take a chance on possibilities of losses later on.

Well, as a result, stocks of butter on the big markets were greatly increased; and storage butter entered into direct competition with fresh butter. At the same time, production was coming out of its slump and was sending larger and larger quantities of fresh butter to market to compete with these big stocks of storage butter.

Well, of course, this led to a situation something like an irresistible force meeting an immovable body.

Something was bound to pop, and, as might be expected, it was the price level. Prices gained only a bare cent during September, in comparison to the normal September advance of 3 or 4 cents.

You know, also, what happened after that. Instead of the usual 3-cent increase in October, there was an increase of something less than one-fourth cent; and as a substitute for the ordinary 3-cent gain in November, there was a 4-cent drop.

And then, of course, the slump went on through December. And as a fitting climax to a year which saw the average price level return to the pre-war days of 1916, the price hit the lowest mark of the whole year on the last day, December 31.

The EXACT quotations on December 31, by the way, were 28½ cents at New York and 27½ cents at Chicago --- for 92-score butter.

To sum up, the average monthly price for 1930 was 36½ cents a pound, which was the lowest average for any year since 1916.

This is also 8 cents below the 1929 average and approximately 9 cents below the five-year average, from 1925 to 1929.

However, if it is any consolation now, the average for 1930 was still more than 6 cents above the average for the 10 years from 1906 to 1915.

On the production side, the total production for the year was probably about 4 per cent lighter than for 1929. The low point came in August, when the total was 12 per cent less than the total for August the year before. Since then, however, there was a steady gain, until we were actually 1 per cent ahead of the 1929 rate, in November.

Outstanding features of the year, in fact, were that production continued to gain despite declining prices, and that, on the other hand, consumption failed to improve, after falling behind early in the year. It is estimated that total consumption during the year, despite low prices, was around 1 per cent less than in 1929.

Now, what I've passed on to you, as a result of my talk with Mr. Venske, is simply a sketch of the high spots in the butter industry during 1930, with which you're all more or less familiar. We might remember, however, that this peculiar behaviour did not originate with 1930. As a matter of fact, it all started back in the fall of 1929, when prices failed to respond to the usual seasonal trend, and dropped instead of rising. In fact, the behaviour of prices in the fall of 1930 was simply a repetition, on a little bigger scale, of what occurred in the fall of 1929.

Well I suppose it may also occur to you that 1930 not only did not originate the situation but it may not bring it to an end.

The immediate facts, of course, are these: After hitting that low level on December 31, prices of butter kept right on going down; and prospects are that the average for January may be as much as 3 or 4 cents below the average for December.

And, it does seem safe to say that, on paper at least, the general outlook for the dairy markets is none too favorable just at present.

However, we will all know more about the outlook next week when the Department of Agriculture completes its annual outlook report. And so, I commend the 1931 report to your special attention.

****

ANNOUNCEMENT: Ladies and Gentlemen, you have been listening to Your Farm Reporter at Washington, reporting on his interview with Mr. W. J. Venske of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. If you would like to have a copy of this talk write either to Station _____ or to the U. S. Department of Agriculture in Washington, D. C.